

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP AUTHORITY**

**TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 2010**

**RE-ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING**

The annual re-organizational meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Authority was called to order at 6:13 p.m. by Chairman Pro Tem Steve Stine on the above date at CET Engineering Services, 1240 North Mountain Road, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

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

**Pledge of Allegiance**

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

**Election of Chairman of the Board**

Mr. Blain made a motion to nominate William Hawk as Chairman of the Authority Board. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion. Mr. Stine called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

**Election of Officers**

Mr. Hawk made a motion to suspend the task of each individual nomination for Authority officers and made the following motion: William Seeds, Sr., Vice-Chairman; Gary A. Crissman, Secretary; David B. Blain, Treasurer; David B. Blain, Assistant Secretary; Stine Law Office, Solicitor; and CET Engineering Services, Engineer. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

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

Mr. Hawk made a motion to approve the regular Authority meeting dates of February 23, May 25, August 24, and November 23, 2010, starting at 6 p.m., in addition to the third Tuesday of each month, prior to the start of the Board of Supervisors meeting. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

## **Approval of Engineer's Agreement**

Mr. Weaver explained that Mr. Wendle, CET Engineering Services, provided an agreement, as part of his appointment that needs to be approved by the Authority Board. Mr. Hawk noted that the letter of agreement states that the fees will remain the same as the 2009 rates, with a \$20,000 retainer and other additional services would be assigned on an hourly rate as noted in the rate schedule.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to accept the Engineer's Agreement as presented. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds questioned if the retainer includes meetings. Mr. Wendle answered that the retainer includes two meetings a month with staff for the update of the I&I work, quarterly meetings, Swatara Township Authority Annual meeting, Authority Annual report, and the Chapter 94 report. He noted that the work is described in Exhibit A-1. Mr. Weaver noted that it would also include bullet items A through L. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

Mr. Crissman thanked Mr. Wendle for maintaining the same 2009 rates. Mr. Wendle explained that the only changes for rates were for a few employees who attained their P.E., and their rates changed as a result of that.

## **BUSINESS MEETING**

### **Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 16, 2010 meeting. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

### **Public Comment**

No comments were provided.

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

No comments were provided.

## **Old Business**

### Action on Change Order #1 for the PC4B/6C Contract

Mr. Weaver explained that this change order was previously reviewed by the Board for inside drop connections recommended by the contractor Michael F. Ronca & Sons, Inc. He noted that the contractor suggested this change as it would make for an easier installation, providing less maintenance for staff in the future, and less risk of replacement. He noted that the original change order showed an increase in the original contract price since the change had to be added to the contract. He noted that this created confusion for staff and the Authority members. He explained that he requested CET to revise the change order to reflect the actual decrease that he believes will be reflected after the inside drops are installed. He noted that the change order reflects a decrease in the overall contract in the amount of \$10,756.00.

Mr. Seeds noted that originally, there was an increase of \$16,400, and with the decrease of \$10,756, it would only result in a \$6,000 increase. Mr. Wendle noted that the purpose of this change order is to relieve any confusion and would replace the prior approved change order. Mr. Shannon noted that the original estimate for decrease was around \$9,000, but when the change order was revised to reflect the decrease, it actually amounted to be \$10,756. He noted that savings was for estimated quantities, but when he took the quantities out of the contract, it became a larger number for net decrease.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve Change Order No. 1 for the PC4B/6C Contract with Michael F. Ronca & Sons, Inc., noting a decrease of \$10,756. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

## **New Business**

### Selection of the storm water/clear water alternative in the BCIA mini-basin project

Mr. Weaver noted that the Board members received a memo from Kevin Shannon and Jared Hockenberry dated February 1, 2010 regarding this issue. Mr. Weaver requested Mr. Whittle to display a picture of the site. He noted that the original project included an alternate bid to alleviate an existing stormwater/clearwater issue in this neighborhood has run into design problems. He noted that the additional survey work and deed work performed by R. J. Fisher & Associates (Fisher) found that some property lines in the area, north of Elmer Avenue, needed to

be revised because the triangle piece on Moyer Street and Blackberry Alley as originally shown was not correct. He noted that Mr. Pinci's property that is located to the west contains portions of land up to Blackberry Alley, and the design intent was to avoid Mr. Pinci's property.

Mr. Weaver stated that he had four alternate solutions, noting that no decision needs to be made at this time. He noted that no staff recommendation is available since there has not been enough time for staff to thoroughly study all four alternatives. He noted that the four alternatives that are included in the memo are currently being revised by Jared Hockenberry. Mr. Crissman questioned how soon the Board must make a recommendation to approve the project. Mr. Weaver answered that the Authority has a contract with Rogele that has not been executed because the Authority has not received its Letter of No Prejudice from PENNVEST. He explained that he would sign the contract in the near future, but could do so without choosing the alternative. Mr. Shannon noted that this work was bid as an alternate at \$46,000 and when the bids were open, it was the Board's intention to award the alternate, however, if the easement is not resolved at the bid award time, he could inquire if special language could be added to the award to cover this. He noted that Rogele intends to do this work last, so there is no immediate rush to resolve the issue.

Mr. Wendle explained that he would like to explain the alternatives and have the Board members provide some guidance. He noted that one alternate would be to complete the project as originally designed when the survey showed that there was an easement to cross at the price of \$46,000. He noted to tie into the stormwater system may cost twice as much money but the Authority would not have to deal with the Pinci right-of-way issue which may be a problem. He noted that he would be looking for some limits from the Board as to what it would want staff to do over the next three months.

Mr. Shannon noted that the orange pipes shown on the plan show the storm sewer that was in place at Elmer and Elaine Avenues prior to 1997. He noted that there are two inlets in the street at each location and they discharge behind the two homes. He noted that there is a small storm system to the right of that area that discharges to Wenrich Street and into the Yingst pasture. He noted that the current issue is with the two discharges from the homes on Elmer and Elaine Avenue. He noted that the darker lines show the work done in 1997, which included the clearwater system and the storm sewer extensions to the north. He noted that many homes in the

area are tied into the clearwater system. Mr. Wolfe explained that this was the Authority's first attempt to build a clearwater system and it was designed by Gannett Fleming.

Mr. Weaver noted that the original consent decree with DEP, which was developed by Gannett Fleming, had a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) that addressed the worse areas in the Beaver Creek basin. He noted that the Authority installed all the "T's", and tested and grouted all the mainline sewers. He explained that Gannett Fleming suggested that I&I could be reduced in the area by installing a clearwater system and installing sump pumps. Mr. Wolfe noted that this area is unique in that it has relatively high ground water and most of the homes do not have basement service; therefore, there was no need to lower the ground water significantly to keep the building sewers out of a high water table.

Mr. Weaver noted that this is similar to the Colonial Crest problem where he proposed to Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) that the Authority may not have to replace all the sewers, taking a select number to eliminate the overflow at the Linglestown Road Pump Station. He noted that CET did a design for 90 homes which is part of the BC-1A basin, and it is believed that this will eliminate the overflow at the pump station by doing the work for the 90 homes. He noted the public meeting went well except for the two homeowners, who complained of the existing stormwater system that has been installed for years, noting that the clearwater system could not run through Mr. Pinci 's property to discharge into the stream at the pump station. He noted that the project had to be concluded at the area where the homeowner has a swamp in his backyard. He noted that the water dissipates into a drainage channel that was constructed by Mr. Pinci.

Mr. Hawk suggested that alternate four is to do nothing. Mr. Wendle noted that alternate four would leave the homeowner with the swampy backyard. Mr. Hawk noted that acquiring an easement from Mr. Pinci would be difficult, and it would require a Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) from the State, so to him, it seems that the choice would be alternate one or three. Mr. Wendle noted that the technical solution would be to build a head wall and dump water onto the Pinci swale which would be alternate one. Mr. Shannon noted that alternate three would be to eliminate the French drains, discharge on top of the ground, and allow the flow onto Pinci's property. He suggested that Pinci could complain that the Authority is adding more peak flow onto his property. Mr. Hawk noted that it seems that alternative one is the best one. Mr. Shannon

noted that alternative three is more expensive. He explained that PENNDOT already installed the new storm sewer and the Authority lost the opportunity to have them install a larger pipe. He noted that he just found that out last week.

Mr. Weaver noted that alternate one would be the least expensive. Mr. Wendle noted that the bid price for that alternate was \$46,000. Mr. Shannon noted that it would require an easement from Mr. Pinci to complete as it would discharge the water on his property.

Mr. Weaver noted that the map shows a large triangle for an easement, but it turned out that it was only a very small triangle to the left, therefore, the project is outside of the public easement triangle and is located on Mr. Pinci's property. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Pinci built his home on what was a lake and he has major water problems. Mr. Wolfe explained that the Township has been dealing with Mr. Pinci since 1988, noting that he built his home on a lot that had a lake, noting that it had been drained or filled in. He noted that Mr. Pinci has blamed the Township for years for causing water problems on his lot even though the ground water is at the surface. He noted, in 1997, the Authority wanted to extend the two red pipes to the north, and reconstruct the swale along the side of Mr. Pinci's property to provide a nice drainage way for an easement, but he refused.

Mr. Weaver noted that the purpose of the project is to eliminate the backyard issues for the two homes, to conclude the project that started back in 1996 and to have a better design for the discharge of the stormwater and clear water for the community. He explained that the water dissipates into the yards and flows into a private drainage swale which is on Pinci property. He stated that he told Mr. Robbins that it is a stormwater issue, noting that the Authority is getting away from clearwater systems. He noted that he and Mr. Robbins agree that running a stormwater pipe into the PENNDOT right-of-way would be the ultimate solution; unfortunately PENNDOT already installed the pipe. He noted that to tie into the pipe, the PENNDOT pipe would have had to be upsized but that is not possible now. Mr. Shannon noted that he wanted to investigate alternate two to determine if it was feasible because all the property owners would be the happiest with that choice. He noted that he was going to present the two costs for alternates to the Authority Board to have them make a decision; however, he found that part of the pipe has been installed by PENNDOT so he can't increase the size of it. He noted that Mr. Robbins requested HRG, Inc. review the drainage counts to determine if they were conservative

and if some more water could be squeezed into the stormwater pipe. He noted that he is waiting to hear from Mr. Robbins. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Robbins met with Mr. Fleming today. Mr. Weaver noted that this would be the cleanest job, not having to work with Mr. Pinci or having water back up on properties. He noted that there should be no increase in flows over the current levels, but one unknown would be, after the sewer work is completed, would the sump pumps be pumping more water. He noted that all the clearwater that was going into the sewer lines would be going into the sump pumps. He noted that the sump pumps take all the water from the neighborhood to the pump station where it discharges to the stream. He noted that this is not the cheapest alternate and CET would be providing a cost estimate. He noted that the original design cost is only \$46,000, but the Authority would have to condemn Pinci's and Heckler's property. He explained that the survey line for the Heckler property shows that Mr. Heckler's shed and fence are located on the neighbor's property.

Mr. Wendle noted that he could ask Rogele for a change order if it turned out that the PENNDOT pipe was large enough, but he questioned if the Authority would be willing to spend the extra money to solve the problem. He noted that he would not want to spend more money to design something that the Board would not consider. Mr. Shannon questioned, since the Authority has assigned this project to the Township, could the Township take action on this plan. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township could do that on behalf of the Authority as a result of the Management Agreement. Mr. Wendle was concerned as he originally thought that no action could be made for issue this until the May Authority meeting. Mr. Weaver noted that the next Authority meeting would be in March. Mr. Crissman noted that everyone needs to wait for Mr. Robbins to see what he finds out, and he questioned if Mr. Robbins found that he could still use alternate two, would that be staff's recommendation. Mr. Weaver answered yes, but he noted that it would be more expensive.

Mr. Crissman questioned if anyone had any ideas as to what Mr. Robbins would find out. Mr. Shannon suggested that it would be putting a lot of water where it was not designed to go. He noted if HRG, Inc. determines that the pipe could handle the water that would be great. Mr. Weaver suggested that a parallel pipe could be installed. Mr. Wendle noted that it could be done, but it is difficult to determine how much water would be coming out of the clearwater

system. Mr. Shannon suggested that a small pipe could be installed and it could be relieved in the swale that runs along Linglestown Road for the bigger storms.

Mr. Weaver noted that he is trying to correct a problem that occurred many years ago because a homeowner would not cooperate.

## **Township Reports**

### PENNVEST funded projects

#### Paxton Creek Corrective Action Plan (CAP) Schedule

Mr. Weaver noted that these two items can be discussed at the same time. He noted that the proposed construction schedule has been updated.

Mr. Weaver explained that for project 4B-6C, the Authority received the letter of No Prejudice from PENNVEST for Ronca, and they stated construction in December. He explained that it is going slowly on Irene Drive as they had to construct 20 foot deep sewer lines. He noted that they expect to have the sewers constructed by the end of 2011.

Mr. Weaver noted that the PC1A-1C project is currently being designed and is scheduled to be bid in May, 2010. He noted that this may be delayed as he anticipates some design problems at Colonial and Linglestown Road. He noted that there are complications with the State highway.

Mr. Weaver noted that 2D/2C is scheduled to go to bid in October. He noted that these three projects are the result of the CAP and are all contained in the first phase of the Paxton Creek CAP projects that must be constructed over a five-year period to be completed by the end of 2012.

Mr. Weaver noted that 3B is part of the BC-1A contract with Rogele. He noted that the contract would be issued as soon as he receives the Letter of No Prejudice from PENNVEST. He noted that there have been delays in the PENNVEST process due to the changeover of the loan from the Authority to the Township. Mr. Shannon noted that he had received time extensions for all the projects from the contractors until the middle or the end of March. Mr. Seeds questioned what the cause for the hold up is. Mr. Weaver answered that PENNVEST has had such an influx of grant awards and loans, that they are overwhelmed with work. He noted

that he hopes to receive the letter this week. He noted that Rogele has stated that they plan to bring out four to five crews to work the 3B and BC-1A projects. He noted for the Linglestown Pump Station and AR/A projects, the contractors were scheduled to start but they are not in a big hurry since the projects do not fall under the consent order. He explained that PENNVEST provides for two years to complete the projects, and they can wait until May or June to start the work. He noted that this would free up some inspectors for the Rogele work.

Mr. Weaver explained, for the 1A/1C project, the public meeting went well, and for the most part everyone was cooperative. He noted that there are 39 easements needed for this project. He noted that he and Mr. Hornung met with Mr. Harteis who lives in the area. He explained that Mr. Smigel's property is adjacent to the Harteis land and part of Mr. Smigel's driveway, lights, trees and landscaping are located on the Harteis property. He noted that he is working with both Mr. Harteis and Mr. Smigel to come up a solution to the problem.

Mr. Weaver noted that this project runs along Colonial Road and Linglestown Road, that are State roads, and he usually finds that all the utilities are squeezed into a very small area. He noted that the sewer lines run against the telephone poles and the 18 inch reinforced concrete storm sewer pipe runs over the sanitary sewer line. Mr. Shannon noted that there is a natural gas line conflict in the area of Avon Drive. Mr. Weaver noted that when staff finds these kinds of problems, it does not want to recreate them. He noted that he needs to replace the infrastructure and it should be in place for a long time; therefore, he does not want to recreate the same problems for future replacements. He noted that there is no space to move the pipe as it would be in the road right-of-way line. He noted that Mr. Hockenberry is studying different options for this design, but it has been suggested to bid this project with an option to line the pipe or replace the pipe. He noted that the replacement costs could be very expensive due to the many precautions that would be needed and having to replace the stormwater as well. He noted that infrastructure may last longer if it is replaced, but he was unable to determine how long the lining would last if that option was chosen. He noted that there would be two bids for this project, one to replace and one to line.

Mr. Weaver explained that he would have to go through Arooga's parking lot and the same utility issues would occur on Linglestown Road. He noted that a company could line the

pipe sections in a day, whereas replacement would be a much longer process. He noted that it would have a large impact on traffic at a very busy intersection.

#### Spring Creek Restrictor

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Whittle has been doing some meter analysis for the last few wet weather events, and he had a concern, if the restrictor was removed, would there be local overflows in the sewer system. He noted that there were numerous events with no overflows and all of a sudden, a number of overflows occurred. Mr. Whittle explained that the initial data looks favorable. He noted that there was a build up in one line from tree routes that was restricting the flow. He noted that Mr. Brallier provided him data on the January event and he wants to review how those lines reacted to the large event. Mr. Weaver explained that the Swatara Township Authority (STA) provided some upgraded models, but CET pointed out that they were not correct as they did not include the maximum flow for Lower Paxton Township. He noted that originally the numbers looked great, however, if you take the restrictor out then there would be no problems, but the STA did not plug in the right amount of flow. He noted that STA redid the model, but he has not received a copy of it. He explained that he hopes to be able to remove the restrictor. Mr. Whittle noted that there were five events in the past three years that had overflows where the Township would not have exceeded the inter-municipal agreement. He noted that the restrictor is causing overflows even when the Township is below its limits. He explained, when the restrictor is removed, Mr. Wetzel must secure easements to get to it, and it could be accessed more easily through Susquehanna Township. He noted that it is much more difficult to access the restrictor by way of Arlington Avenue.

#### Beaver Creek Wet Weather Treatment Facility

Mr. Weaver noted that there is nothing new to report about this item. Mr. Wendle explained that he updated the stormwater permits to prevent the Authority from losing the permits. He noted that PPL made contact with him in regards to the electrical upgrade.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the heavy snow fall and snow melt had any impact on the sewer flows. Mr. Whittle explained if the area received a warm rain at this time and it hurried the melting process, there would be an impact. He noted that an inch of rainfall with all the snow melt would be more like 2.5 inches of rain. He noted that the slow snow melt process does not

have a major affect on flows. Mr. Whittle noted that the Township has significantly reduced the number of overflows with all the work that has been completed. He noted that the Beaver Creek and Linglestown Pump Stations repairs have helped in this matter. Mr. Seeds noted that the Township had an overflow in December 2009. Mr. Whittle noted that it occurred at the restrictor and the Township would not have exceeded its limit. Mr. Shannon noted in 2009 there were no overflows in Beaver Creek or Paxton Creek. He noted that the only overflow that occurred in 2009 was at the restrictor. He noted in January 2010, there was an overflow at the Gale Drive Pump station. Mr. Seeds noted that the Township exceeded its allotted capacity in December 2009 for the STA treatment plant. Mr. Wendle explained that it was based on an average flow so the Township could experience a month with a lot of rainfall, even if it did not occur all at once, the Township would exceed its average daily flow at STA, but it did not cause an overflow because it did not all happen at once. Mr. Seeds noted if the Township has overflows two months in a row, it would be put back on restrictions. Mr. Wendle answered that the Township did not have two overflows within two months. Mr. Weaver noted that the Township was over in December 2009 at 3.7 and the January 2010 level was 3.0. Mr. Weaver noted if you experience a significant snow melt in the spring, traditionally it does cause problems. He noted that once the groundwater reaches a certain level it can have a significant affect on overflows. He noted that Mr. Whittle can determine if there would be an overflow based on the amount of rain. Mr. Whittle noted that the current level for overflows based on groundwater levels is 1.5 to 2 inches of rain.

Mr. Wendle explained that he showed DEP the level when the Township first experienced overflows, calling it a wet weather event, and then you transitioned into an extreme wet weather event, noting that that line is moving up. He noted that this shows that there is an impact from the work the Authority is doing. He noted that this would be visible in the annual report. Mr. Whittle noted the Earl Drive, Valley Road, and Trunk A Interceptors has helped to removed the overflows.

Mr. Stine noted that he filed the South Hanover Township Appeal on Monday, February 22, 2010. Mr. Weaver noted that he could not move forward with permitting for the Wet Weather Treatment Facility since DEP and legal counsel agreed that it is a mute point until the appeal is settled.

### Swatara Township Treatment Plant Upgrade

Mr. Weaver noted that three issues of major concern were discussed during the Annual Swatara Township Treatment Facility Meeting. He explained that the Township received a grant in the amount of \$479,000 towards the upgrades to the Treatment facility. He noted that there is a chance that the Authority will get back some of that money if there are no substantial change orders for the project. He noted that Mr. Wendle suggested that since much of the infrastructure is in the ground, that type of project produces many change orders. He noted if there are minimal change orders, then the STA may payback 75% to 80% of the grant to the Authority. Mr. Seeds questioned when the work is projected to be finished. Mr. Weaver answered the end of 2010.

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wendle indicated to Mr. Spare that the Authority is interested in purchasing some of the West Hanover Township capacity that it recently acquired. He noted that Mr. Spare stated that he could not divulge how much capacity they may have available as there is one manufacturer who may need it. Mr. Seeds questioned what Swatara Township paid West Hanover Township for the capacity. Mr. Wendle answered that he did not know as it was never divulged, noting that it would be a public record. Mr. Wendle explained that he informed the Swatara Township Authority that Lower Paxton was interested in discussing the purchase of additional capacity. Mr. Seeds noted that West Hanover Township would never need capacity from the Authority's interceptor if the Wet Weather Treatment Plant is built. Mr. Wendle noted that West Hanover is completely out of the picture. Mr. Weaver explained that Swatara Township wanted to get West Hanover Township out of the picture before going to construction and that is the main reason they bought the West Hanover Township capacity. He suggested that Swatara Township had to pay a substantial amount of money for something it had no immediate need for.

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wendle presented an update to the STA regarding the Township's proposal to build a solar facility at the landfill and its intent to discuss selling the electricity to the Swatara Township facility. Mr. Wendle noted that they did not seem to have any problem with that, as their cooperation is an essential part of the overall project.

Mr. Weaver noted that Scott Wyland indicated that there was a precedent setting case with Labor and Industry regarding the Prevailing Wages Act and how it applies to sanitary sewer replacements. He noted that a municipality appealed its case to Labor and Industry, arguing the

case that replacement is maintenance and it would not fall under the Prevailing Wage Act. He noted that he asked Mr. Stine if the next project could be bid without prevailing wages and what the impact would be if the decision was overturned. He noted that Mr. Stine responded that the Authority would be liable to pay the additional wages. He suggested that it could provide to be a windfall for the Authority over time since the bidding prices should decrease a little. He noted that the case before Labor and Industry is under appeal. Mr. Stine explained that these types of cases start at Labor and Industry, noting that they have their own hearing officer.

### **Engineer's Report**

Mr. Shannon noted, at the last meeting, the Board requested CET to shorten the Engineer's Report and he was able to reduce the report to eight pages. He noted that many of the items in the report have already been covered in the meeting.

Mr. Seeds questioned what size pipe and at what elevation it should be installed under the road for the interceptor under Nyes Road. He questioned if a contractor would install the pipe. Mr. Shannon answered that there is an existing interceptor in that location and a parallel interceptor that would be part of the Beaver Creek conveyance system when and if the Township is permitted to built it. He noted that the construction provides for an opportunity to install the pipe now since it would be much more expensive to install the pipe after the road is completed. He noted that Mr. Whittle did some modeling for this project, and found that there had been a more severe storm event in 2005, and he looked a several options, and recommended to remove some flow. He looked at BC 6, which is the area around the Township building and the Kmart area, to do a replacement project in the next several years to get the flows down to a manageable level so that the interceptor could be kept as originally designed. He noted that the new pipe would be a 24 inch pipe installed at a shallow depth. Mr. Wendle noted, to save costs, he would suggest building a shallow interceptor to take overflow when the sewer surcharged, rather than to build it all the way parallel at the same elevation as the existing pipe. He noted that this became a real issue when PENNDOT decided to reconstruct Nyes Road, noting that the elevation level had to be determined. He explained when the April 2, 2005 storm hit it was determined that the shallow pipe would not work, noting that the flows would back up towards BC 6. He noted that he had to make a decision to build a deep pipe and make it larger or remove some flow from the area to use the concept of the shallow sewer. He noted that staff's recommendation is, since the

Authority had to maintain flows in the Beaver Creek basin at or below the flows that were back in 2002, and since replacement should occur over time, it would make sense to do BC6 work to remove the flow and leave the pipe shallow. Mr. Seeds questioned what size the current pipe is. Mr. Wendle answered that it is a 24 inch pipe. Mr. Wendle noted that he intends to leave the existing pipe as is, and install another pipe in the event the Wet Weather Treatment Facility is built. Mr. Weaver noted that the Township has a consent order that states that it must build the facility, noting that the Township cannot ignore the consent decree, and PENNDOT is ready to move ahead with the project. Mr. Seeds questioned what size the new pipe will be. Mr. Shannon answered that would be a parallel 24-inch pipe. Mr. Seeds stated that the Authority is spending money to install a pipe it may never need. Mr. Wendle noted, regardless if the plant is constructed, there would be a need for conveyance improvements to convey water. He noted if the plant does not go through, and the entire sanitary sewer needs replaced, it would be prudent to look at storage, and in order to do storage it must be conveyed to a location for storage. He noted that the treatment site location could be used for storage as well as land that is located uphill and across Nyes Road. He noted that there would be an issue for installing a trickling filter because you would be pumping water a couple hundred feet all day, everyday and it would be too expensive to do this, but not for storage. He noted that the Authority would need conveyance improvements to get water to the location. Mr. Whittle noted that the new 24-inch pipe would be gravity fed. Mr. Shannon noted that the intent is to install a force main across Nyes Road. Mr. Seeds questioned how they would know at what elevation to put the pipe if it is gravity fed. Mr. Whittle answered that he modeled the existing capacity of the pipe and what the metered flows are, noting that the flows that occurred in March of 2008 were much higher than anything that had not been an excused event prior. Mr. Seeds questioned what it would cost to do the pipe installation under the road. Mr. Weaver answered that PENNDOT is working on the design now, and once the contract bids are received, then he would know what the costs would be. He noted that the total conveyance improvement at the time the plant was designed, ten years ago was \$6 million and the treatment plant costs were \$10 million.

Mr. Shannon explained that PENNDOT is doing the Nyes Road project as a design-build project and they have a contractor on board. He noted that he has provided PENNDOT with the information as to what they want to incorporate into their project and they need to get the costs

back to the Authority once they design it. He suggested that it may be \$200,000 for the two or three runs they want to install.

Mr. Seeds noted that the Authority tabled the issue of PENNDOT owing the Authority money, from a previous meeting. He noted that PENNDOT owes the Authority \$6,418.19 and the Authority owes PENNDOT \$5,075.00. Mr. Weaver noted that staff did not propose any action on this since the Authority would owe PENNDOT additional money for other projects, and Mr. Fox suggested that the Authority not sign the letter since there were things in the agreement that he did not like. Mr. Shannon noted, for the Union Deposit Road project, the Authority owes PENNDOT money and if the difference for the Mountain Road project was dismissed, then the Authority would dismiss the Union Deposit Road bill. He noted that PENNDOT never responded to the Authority's request. Mr. Seeds noted that the report states that the Authority tabled action at its May 18, 2009 meeting, and it needs to take action on this matter. Mr. Weaver stated that the Authority does not need to take action because the Authority owes PENNDOT money and PENNDOT may never request the Authority for the funds. Mr. Seeds noted that PENNDOT owes the Authority money from past projects. Mr. Weaver explained that the Authority received the money about a year or two ago, however PENNDOT is behind in its reimbursements. Mr. Wendle noted that the Authority is sitting on the difference between the two projects and the ball is in PENNDOT's court.

Mr. Seeds noted, in regards to the Pinci issue, it was stated that there was a paper alley in the vicinity. Mr. Weaver noted that it was thought that there was a paper alley, but when Mr. Fisher did the survey, although the original plan showed the alley, it was found to be incorrect. Mr. Shannon noted that the paper alley disappeared with one of the Saint Thomas re-subdivision plans as it was absorbed in with the back of the lots.

Mr. Wendle noted, for the Oakhurst Interceptor, Donco Construction is going to build the interceptor from North Progress Avenue to the middle of his Sturbridge development which is within 2,700 feet of the Gale Drive Pumping Station. He noted that there are pending agreements between Donco Construction and the Susquehanna Township Authority and between Susquehanna Township and Lower Paxton Township Authorities. He suggested that this should be very favorable to the Lower Paxton Township to include providing pipe and inspection services the Authority would receive beyond its share of capacity in the line. He noted that

Donco Construction would share a good portion of the burden. He noted that Mr. Vartan's son stated that he would only sign the easement if it could be proven that the project would be built within three years. He noted that Donco Construction plans to start the construction this year and when it is finished, as part of the Act 537 Plan, there would be a need to construct the rest of the pipe to the Gale Drive Pumping Station in order to remove that pumping station from service. Mr. Seeds noted that the Township would have to pay for the increased capacity to the pipe. Mr. Wendle explained that it would only be a portion of the costs. He noted that he figured what it would cost to put an eight-inch line for the Donco Development and then the costs for a 15-inch line and the difference is the increment that the Authority would pay. Mr. Wendle noted that there are issues with paying the replacement of tapping fees since the Authority would start with existing capacity as opposed to developers coming in. He noted that this is the reason the Authority is making its contribution up front because the Authority is putting flow in, but the others would be waiting for developers to pay their share. Mr. Shannon explained, to close the Gale Drive Pumping Station; the Authority would have to build the line from the pump station to Donco's line, an area of 2,700 feet. Mr. Weaver noted that the Vartan land is in Susquehanna Township, noting that the pipe must go through another property that the Authority does not have the easement for at this time.

Mr. Seeds questioned when the Authority can take the Springford Village Plant out of service. Mr. Weaver answered after the Wet Weather Treatment Plant is constructed, six months after it is proved to be working, the plant could be taken out of commission. Mr. Seeds questioned if there is a way to close the Springford Village Plant if the Wet Weather Treatment Plant is not built. Mr. Whittle noted that the Authority would have to increase the interceptor and provide storage or have removed enough flow from other areas in the system. Mr. Seeds questioned how much flow would need to be removed. Mr. Wendle noted that 30,000 gallons of flow per day would need to be removed. Mr. Weaver noted that the Authority could attempt to negotiate this with DEP if the plant is not built.

### **Solicitor's Report**

Mr. Stine noted he 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 7:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle  
Recording Secretary

Approved by:

Gary A. Crissman  
Authority Secretary