

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
AUTHORITY MEETING**

Minutes of Township Authority Meeting held November 24, 2009

An administrative meeting of the Lower Paxton Township Authority was called to order at 6:06 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; Steven Stine, Authority Solicitor; William Weaver, Sewer Authority Director; Jim Wetzal, Operations Manager; Jeffrey Wendle and Kevin Shannon, CET Engineering; and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Blain made a motion to approve the minutes of the November 3, 2009 Authority meeting. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

Public Comment

No comments were presented.

New Business

Review of the 2010 Draft Budget

Mr. Weaver explained that this is the second review of the 2010 budget. He noted that Mr. Wendle provided his projections for the 2010 rates at \$116 per quarter with no increase proposed for the 2010 budget. He noted that 24,000 EDU's at \$116 per quarter provides revenues of \$11,400,000. He noted that the tapping fees are projected at \$193,000 with one hotel planned, the Allentown Boulevard Hotel that would result in 44 EDU's for a total of 132 EDU's. He noted that the Township liquid funds used to pay bills is budgeted at \$45,000 and the PLGIT Interest Income from the Build America Bonds (BABs) bonds is \$225,000, based upon the investment of the \$40 million BABs funds. He noted that the interest rates are very low as the Authority is only allowed to invest in three types of securities. He explained that he locked in a rate with PLGIT

yesterday since he was advised that the rates would drop even lower in the next week, and hopes that the interest rate would increase next year. Mr. Blain questioned what interest rate Mr. Weaver received. Mr. Weaver answered that PLGIT provided a average yield of .7%, investing in three different securities. Mr. Blain noted that most economists expect the rates to go up. He noted that the Federal government can't keep buying and funding money at the rate that they are currently funding it. Mr. Weaver noted that the forecast was changed a few days ago because of the lack of housing starts. He noted, in terms of long term investments, the investment has to be collateralized, and there are very few banks that will do that type of investment. Mr. Wendle noted that when they were first discussing this interest rate, he was looking at 1.3% to 1.5% interest rate. Mr. Weaver noted that he did not want to lock in a lot of the money yet because he was waiting for the rates to go up, but he did not want to lose money as the interest rate continues to drop, therefore, he wanted to lock into a rate before it dipped much further.

Mr. Weaver noted that that the BABs Bond Interest subsidy is projected at \$868,643. He noted that he anticipated receiving \$10,000 in reimbursements from PENNDOT and \$30,000 for the escrow reimbursement. He noted that this results in overall revenues of \$12,771,643.

Mr. Weaver noted that there is no change in the Operating Fund for the management reimbursement which is budgeted at \$1,633,564. He noted that office expenses are slated at \$37,000; computer costs, \$21,500; and audit fees at \$14,000. He noted that he plugged in a small increase for telephone and postage. He noted that the insurance rates are based upon recent quotes from the insurance provider and they are adjusted based upon the calendar year. He noted that all of the expenditures remain the same and are no major equipment purchases are planned in 2010.

Mr. Seeds questioned why the Authority pays real estate taxes. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Authority must pay real estate taxes on the property that it owns, the one proposed plant site, located in South Hanover Township and the storage site in Susquehanna Township.

Mr. Weaver noted that the Operations Budget includes the costs for the Springford Village Treatment Plant, with sewer maintenance costs remaining at the same amount, however, the pump station maintenance was reduced due to the upgrades to the Beaver Creek Pump Station and the planned upgrade to the Linglestown Pump Station.

Mr. Weaver noted that some changes were made for transmissions. He noted that Swatara Township does not plan a rate increase, however, for the City of Harrisburg, the budget does not include any past due amounts from 2007 through 2009, but assumes that the City will bill the

2007-15% increase and an additional 10% increase in 2010. He noted that Susquehanna Township has been advised by their solicitor to contact the city to correct their billing as well. Mr. Weaver explained that the City incorrectly billed the Township in the amount of \$1 million. He explained that according to the City's budget they must conduct a rate study and would notify the Authority by December 1st what the rate would be. He explained that representatives from HRG, Inc. had informed him that the City was planning to increase the rate by 10%, but the new administration is not interested in raising rates. He suggested that the City would not increase rates in 2010. He noted that his counterpart for the City of Harrisburg told him that the City is experiencing a \$1 million deficit and his recommendation was to raise the rates, and he budgeted a 10% increase for 2010.

Mr. Seeds noted that the budget includes the increase rate for renting the land on Locust Lane and the office space at Prince Street. Mr. Weaver answered yes. He noted that he would address that issue later in the agenda.

Mr. Weaver noted that he would like to discuss the debt service at this time. He noted that it has changed considerably for 2010 budget. He noted that 2009 principal for the interest on those bonds has changed to \$455,000. He noted that he added the PENNVEST principal and interest. He noted that the settlement date has been pushed back based upon Tom Smida's office. He noted that the BAB'S bonds show no principal and interest in 2010. He noted that the debt structure provides for a break this year, noting that the total debt service is \$4,820,187. He explained that capitalized interest is \$795,840, noting that the actual debt service including the deduction of BAB'S interest subsidy is \$3,951,544. Mr. Weaver noted that the total Authority expenditures are budgeted at \$12,037,439. He reviewed the Capital Fund budget and noted that it includes \$334,000 for the Linglestown Road Pump Station which is a PENNVEST funded project.

Mr. Weaver noted that the I&I Budget was prepared based the Second Consent Decree with the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and PENNVEST projects. He noted that it includes the PC-4B sewer replacement costs that were awarded to Michael F. Ronca and Sons based upon 25% completion of that project. He noted that no construction is planned in 2010 for PC-1A; however, engineering and survey work would be completed using the budget estimate of \$200,000. He noted for PC-1C, \$3,100,000 is budgeted for the completion of this project in 2010. He noted that he hopes to save some costs by using a Township crew to complete part of this project. He noted that for PC-2D, \$210,000 is budgeted for engineering and

survey work, and for PC-6C, Michael F. Ronca and Sons was awarded the bid in the amount of \$3,100,000 to complete this project in 2010. He noted for PC-2C, the budget includes 20% of the over all cost of the project at \$550,000. He noted that BC-1A project has been awarded to Rogele, Inc., for \$1,200,000 and this assumes that this project will be completed in 2010. He noted that the Asylum Run project has been awarded to N. Abbonizio Contractors, Inc., and the budget assumes 30% of the project to be completed in 2010 at a cost of \$1,350,000. He noted that Rogele has been awarded the PC-3B project using PENNVEST funds estimating an 80% completion rate in 2010 in the amount of \$600,000.

Mr. Weaver noted that the mainline external repairs are budgeted at \$120,000 for the collection system, as well as \$100,000 for metering cost, \$28,000 for GIS Program, and \$35,000 for the data analysis of all metering in the mini-basins. He noted that the Capital funds for I&I services amount to \$11,970,500, for a total of Capital funds at \$12,304,500.

Mr. Weaver noted that he requested Mr. Wendle to prepare an alternative rate schedule to include the debt service for the new financing for all the PENNVEST projects. Mr. Wendle explained that he normally would prepare the debt service out for 20 years; however he prepared this document out to 2041.

Mr. Wendle explained that the rate projections for financing were based upon Alternative C. He noted that the revenues for 2010 are \$11,400,000, and he deducted the BAB's subsidy from the revenues to determine this number. He noted that this is shown as the Operating Surplus in the amount of \$734,168. He explained that this holds the rate at \$116 per-quarter for the year 2010. He noted in 2011, the debt service increases by \$600,000 but it is subsidized with capitalized debt, and it does not reach \$5.2 million mark until 2013. He noted, for 2011, he shows an increase of \$1.8 million due to the City of Harrisburg who will need to buy credits or make upgrades for the Chesapeake Bay project. He noted that this would raise the rates to \$125. He explained that he was trying to maintain a reserve fund between \$5 million and \$6 million, and not increase the rates any more than \$10 per quarter in any year; therefore, he had to drop the reserve to \$4.5 million to hold the rates. He noted that the Authority would continue to have a surplus in 2010 and maintain the current rate of \$116 per quarter. He explained, if the City of Harrisburg does not implement a huge rate increase, the current rate could be held the same for another year.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the Chesapeake Bay TMDL project is an unfunded mandate. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mr. Hawk noted that it could end up being a very expensive project. Mr.

Wolfe noted that he has heard nothing from the City of Harrisburg for this issue. Mr. Hawk suggested that the plans have to be in place by May 1, 2010. Mr. Wendle noted that the EPA said that it is up to the individual states, and the State said that it is not planning to make the point sources do anymore than they are required to do under the plan that was adopted by the State of Pennsylvania, and that is to cap at the treatment plant sources at design flow at 6 milligrams per liter total Nitrogen and .8 milligrams per liter for total Phosphorus. He noted that at this point, the requirements that the City of Harrisburg is facing are not going to change. He noted that he built into his projections, based upon the City's Act 537 Plan, that they would not receive a grant. He suggested that it would cost the Township an additional \$1.7 million, starting in 2011. Mr. Hawk questioned if they were looking for a 20% decrease in TMDL. Mr. Wendle noted that the treatment plants had to reduce their Nitrogen and Phosphorus levels by 33%. He noted that the point sources contributed around 15 million pounds a year, and they had to get it down to roughly 10 million pounds per year of Nitrogen. He assumed that in 2011, the costs will be passed from the City of Harrisburg to Lower Paxton, Susquehanna Townships and others.

Mr. Crissman questioned what the single variable that causes the deficit or surplus for the operating expenses is. Mr. Wendle answered that he projects a Series of 2014 bonds, so it shows payments in 2015. He noted that there would be another borrowing in 2019. Mr. Crissman noted that he does not want to hit the ratepayers with a huge increase and the reason for his wanting to insure level debt service. Mr. Wendle noted that he held the number of no more that \$10 increase per quarter for each year. He noted that it would provide some flexibility in any given years depending on what reserved amounts the Board wants to have. He noted that he projected \$250,000 less in interest than what was originally projected, he still projects a surplus for next year. Mr. Wendle noted that it is also dependent on what the City of Harrisburg does with the underpayment issue too. Mr. Crissman noted that the \$855,000 is the highest operating deficit in the spreadsheet. Mr. Wendle noted that he took his best shot at trying to predict when the City of Harrisburg would increase their rates to pay for the Chesapeake Bay project.

Mr. Weaver noted that City of Harrisburg has a lot of debt and he proposed that the Authority take on its share of that debt, noting that it would not need insurance to borrow the money at a lesser rate, and then it could control its debt. He noted that this is the same approach the Authority took with the Swatara Treatment Plant. He noted that the Authority paid its share of the improvement costs. He noted that the City of Harrisburg claims that the Township has no capacity, and this would become a legal issue in terms of what the Township owns. Mr. Stine

noted that it is work that the Authority is required to do in order to send sewage to the plant, so he does not think that the Authority would have to own anything in the plant as long as it is paying for what the Authority is required to do. He noted that he does not understand the theory of how the Township can send sewage flows to the City if it has no capacity. He noted that, in order to send so many gallons per day to the City, the Authority would be required to contribute a certain amount for the upgrades. He noted if it is a requirement, then the Authority should be able to finance its financial share.

Mr. Weaver noted that the City of Harrisburg is one of the Authority's largest expense, and it never explains anything to the Authority. He noted that he does not know how much cash the City has, and how much they need to borrow. He explained, if the Township takes on its own debt, it can structure the debt and have more control over future rates. Mr. Crissman suggested that the Township may find it easier to work with the new administration in January. Mr. Hawk noted that the City of Harrisburg may find that Lower Paxton Township is more of a help than a hindrance.

Mr. Wendle noted that the difficulty is that the Township has no defined capacity and everyone pays a portion of the debt service that they have for the existing plant based upon the EDU's that are connected. He noted, if the Township approves more development, then it would pay for more of the debt service of the plant. He noted that if the Township borrows the money to pay for its share of the debt, then it must be defined what the Township's share is and this could be problematic as it would involve flow meters. Mr. Weaver stated that the Township has meters, and it has a rate of capacity for the plant. Mr. Weaver noted that the Township could borrow the money cheaper and have more control over its debt service. He noted that he could talk to the new Public Works Director for the City of Harrisburg. Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Weaver should wait until the new administration is in place.

Mr. Wendle noted that it would be good if the City of Harrisburg would provide the Authority with an accounting of their costs. Mr. Weaver noted that the Authority prefers to do much of its own work instead of contracting out work. He noted that the I & I crew can do the work cheaper than most contractors. He explained that 40% of the City's goes towards other contracted services and he questioned why they are contracting out all those services.

Mr. Weaver noted that the sewer rate would be maintained at the same amount of \$116 per quarter, and he is very pleased to be able to do this as the rates have been slowly rising for the past seven years since 2002.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the budget for the Authority at its current rate of \$116 per quarter. Mr. Blain seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Wendle if the projected rate increases for the future would be roughly \$10 per quarter. Mr. Wendle answered that was correct based up on the current data.

Action on the amendment to the lease agreement with LPT
for the tract of land at 5979 Locust Lane

Action on the amendment to the lease agreement with LPT
for office space at 425 Prince Street

Mr. Weaver explained, in regards to the management agreement, he checked with local Townships and found their ratio to be 20% of the Authority costs paid to the Township. He noted that there was no opportunity to make changes in the budget for this line item; however, he reviewed the lease agreements with the Township, and found that the lease agreement for 5979 Locust Lane only provides for \$1 for the land. This was due to the Authority giving the old garage, located on Peach Street, back to the Township in 2002. He noted that the Township, mainly the Public Works and the Parks and Recreation Departments uses the facility to store equipment and items. He noted that it has been eight years since the Authority paid \$1 for the land, and noting that there is a value for the land, he called some local realtors to determine lease prices for both the facility at 5979 Locust Lane and the office space located at 425 Prince Street. He noted that the fair market value for the land is between \$800 to \$1,000 per month at today's values. He noted that he presented an amendment to the agreement to include a monthly lease of \$800 to the Township for the land on Locust Lane.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there would be a problem changing the lease as it was a 10-year lease. Mr. Stine noted if both parties agree, there is not problem in making changes. Mr. Seeds questioned if this change could be retroactive, starting in December instead of January. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Authority and Township could make this change. Mr. Weaver noted that he recommended the retroactive agreement for this year as it would be much easier for the auditors. He noted that the change could be made in the current budget year and it would be reflected in the 2010 audit for the year 2009. He noted that the Township operates the Authority at no profit, so it is a reasonable expense. Mr. Wolfe noted that this is a good deal for the Authority, since it is dollar-for-dollar service cost in addition to the management agreement. He explained that there is no reason for the Township to give its land away.

Mr. Weaver explained that he continues to keep his operating costs low since he had to raise the sewer rates the past seven years. He noted that all the Departments made difficult choices to reduce costs and to find ways to bolster the budget. He noted that these lease amendments were the only way that the Authority could help the budget. He noted that the lease for the office space at 425 Prince Street provides for a 3% adjustment based upon the Consumer Price Index (CPI), however, that did not keep up with the current market values. He noted that the value for leasing office space has increased more than 3%. He noted that he researched the average rental space and found, for a Class-B office rental space, the average rent is \$16 to \$19 per square foot.

Mr. Wolfe explained that the total of the two amendments, if the Authority chooses to accept them would result in additional yearly revenues of \$17,000 to the Township. He noted that it would also amount to an expenditure of \$17,000 to the Authority as well. Mr. Seeds questioned if the other departments budget for rental space. Mr. Wolfe explained that the Authority is a separate entity from the Township, and it has the right to pay for its own services and generates revenues on its own to pay for those services. He noted that no other part of the Township has that ability to exist solely on its own, not even the Friendship Center. Mr. Blain noted that this is the time to adjust rates since the market rates that they are providing are lower than what they were two years ago. He noted that the Authority should pay their fair share of what the rate is.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the amendment to the lease agreement with Lower Paxton Township for the tract of land at 5979 Locust Lane and the amendment to the lease agreement with Lower Paxton Township for office space at 425 Prince Street. Mr. Blain seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

Township Reports

DEP Second Consent Degree

Mr. Weaver noted that little has changed over the past couple of months. He noted that Mr. Wendle has completed the engineering and bidding of the PENNVEST projects, and provided a Group 1 Mini-Basin list of priority for 2007 through 2012 for the Paxton Creek. He explained that PC4B and PC6C have already been awarded, and PCIA and PCIC are included in the 2010 budget. He noted that the proposed completion date for the first five mini-basins is 2012.

Status of Corrective Action Plans for Beaver, Paxton, and Spring Creeks

Mr. Weaver noted that the Authority finally received the First Amendment to the Second Consent decree. Mr. Stine noted that it took almost four years to complete this amendment.

Mr. Stine noted that he has not heard anything from Judge Turgeon since arguments were presented in May for the wet weather treatment plant suit filed by South Hanover Township.

Engineers Report

Mr. Weaver noted, as part of the Nyes Road project, an analysis was done for the wet weather treatment facility collection system, and a model was required. He noted that part of the maintenance plan required that the Authority keep the loads at the current level. He suggested that Mr. Wendle should discuss this as part of his Engineer's Report. Mr. Wendle noted, on page three, item five, he discussed this project in detail. He explained that he received the plans from PENNDOT regarding the widening of Nyes Road, and found that it involves the area that the wet weather facility conveyance improvements are planned.

Mr. Wendle explained, in March of 2008, there was a large overflow event that was unexcused by DEP, and since the plant has not been built yet, he felt that is was very important to study the data in terms of a new plant. He explained that he had planned to build a shallow section five to six feet deep as opposed to building a much deeper section, and discharge the force main into the shallow section. He noted that this would save money and allow the sewer to surcharge and spill into it. He noted with the new flows, if you allow it to surcharge with the flows being so high in BC-6, then it would result in a spill upstream. He noted that he had to do considerable modeling in order to tell PENNDOT where to install the pipes. He noted if PENNDOT rebuilds Nyes Road and doesn't install the pipes, then the Authority would have to tunnel the pipes in. He questioned if two pipes should be installed at the same grade, and forget about the overflow sewer. He noted, in Beaver Creek, the Authority must maintain the flows, and some rehab work would have to be done, so he suggested doing mini-basin work in BC-6 which has the highest use, and then using the credits to offset any increases that occur overtime. He noted that the design would remain as is, since it would decrease the flows. He noted that it would entail doing a substantial mini-basin project in Beaver Creek. Mr. Weaver noted that BC-6 is located east and north of Locust Lane towards Nyes Road. He noted that this area has been

in very bad shape and it has many clay pipes that are failing and is one of the oldest sections of the system.

Mr. Hornung questioned, if the flows are increasing, what is the source of the problem. Mr. Weaver answered that the clay pipes continue to deteriorate and the joints are bad. Mr. Hornung questioned if the increases are from BC-6. Mr. Wendle answered that the increase in flow was from the storm event. He noted, if you look at the control basin, all the data that the Authority had in the basin was at a certain level, however, the storm levels were very high. He noted that the Authority had not experienced that high a flow rate for that area before. He noted, in DEP's logic, since they did not excuse the event, then you cannot have an overflow. He noted if the Authority does not eliminate the overflows, then DEP may not allow any more permits to be issued. Mr. Weaver noted that the Authority will be replacing sewers for 20 years in the Paxton Creek basin. He noted that at this time the Board has directed staff to continue with the wet weather treatment plant, however, four of five years from now the Board may change its mind, and if it does, then the Authority would be ahead of the game, because BC-6 would be completed.

Mr. Wolfe noted that a requirement of the consent order is to undertake maintenance to prevent overflows. Mr. Hornung noted that Mr. Wendle suggested using the oversized pipe at the same elevation of the existing sanitary sewer main and to complete a mini-basin to get the flows down. Mr. Weaver noted that one advantage is that the bids are coming in much lower than expected. He noted that the last two bids were 25% below the engineer's estimate. He noted that he would direct the engineer to start the BC-6 mini basin project.

Mr. Weaver noted that Swatara Township has been so busy with their upgrades at the treatment plant that they have not finished the modeling for the Spring Creek Interceptor.

Update on PENNVEST Construction Projects

Mr. Weaver noted that bond counsel is preparing the paperwork to handover the Authority projects to the Township. He explained that he provided copies of the letters that the contractors were required to sign prior to issuing the notice to proceed. Mr. Shannon noted that he is waiting for Rogele and Lepley letters (the electrical contractor for Linglestown Road project) to be returned. He noted that the only problem he has had is the turn around time for paperwork with PENNVEST and DEP. He explained that he had to push back the date for settlement to allow time to do the Township transfer as well. He noted that this has delayed the

contractors from starting construction, and he hopes to have most of the projects underway in January 2010.

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Hogentogler was working with Ms. Fasolt, to complete the payment request form to the Department of Economic Development for the \$1.5 million dollars. He noted that he had 15 days to complete the form and return it. He explained that he spoke with Mr. Bonawitz, the auditor, and he advised him that it is not revenue for 2010 and he recommend that it not be included in the 2010 budget but rather be included in the 2009 budget. Mr. Wolfe noted that this is the H20 Grant funds.

Mr. Hornung noted that Mr. Weaver mentioned that he had two sewer blockages, and he questioned where they occurred. Mr. Weaver noted that he had tree root issues in the Spring Creek area. He noted that it occurred in the main interceptor that crosses Locust Lane. He explained that the overflows were due to tree roots, however, he is re-metering everything in Spring Creek area to get good data for the overflows. Mr. Hornung questioned if anyone's basement was flooded. Mr. Weaver answered no.

Mr. Shannon noted that Mr. Wendle and Mr. Weaver hit most of the highlights for the Engineer's Report. He noted that his design efforts are concentrated on PC-1A and PC-1C. He noted that all the permit applications have been submitted, and he plans to have a neighborhood meeting the second week of January. He suggested that the project would be advertised in February after he received the permits. He noted that he is working on the last Paxton Creek projects, PC-2C and PC-2D, located near Linglestown.

Mr. Wendle explained that the Engineer's Report is fairly long since it includes background information, and there are notations for items with no change. He suggested that it may be wise to move to an abbreviated report that would only detail the items that change, especially since the report is now available as a PDF in the Board's on line packet. Mr. Blain stated that he prefer to read the abbreviated report.

Mr. Wendle explained that there is a new way to bid projects called PennBid. He noted that it is an electronic bidding system, and suggested that it would save money and bring more bidders to the project. He noted that the solicitor would need to review the program to determine if paper bids would also need to be done. He noted that it would not cost the Authority to be included in the bidding program, as only the contractors pay the fees. He suggested that the process could be used for the bidding of asphalt, gasoline and other projects. He noted that most of the bidding using the PennBid process has occurred in the eastern part of the State since that is

where the process was started. He noted that it has been used in a number of projects, and he suggested that the Authority and Township may want to consider it for future bids. He noted, if Mr. Stine feels that it would meet the Township's requirements, then he would like to try to bid a project electronically. He explained that he was told that the Authority would receive better prices because vendors could wait until the last minute to post their bids. Mr. Shannon explained that a bidder could enter a bid and make revisions up until the bid closing time. He noted that it would cut down on the engineer's labor costs since there would be no need to send the plans or specifications to be printed. He noted that all the documents would be uploaded to the website, and once the contractors are in the system, it may become a paperless process. Mr. Crissman questioned if the advertisement would continue to be required for the newspaper. Mr. Stine answered yes, and the Authority would have to have a paper document for those contractors who are not members of the website. He noted that those contractors could not be excluded. Mr. Crissman questioned how the vendor controls the bidding process. Mr. Wendle explained that the bid form would be on line and when the deadline occurs, the bid is removed from the website. Mr. Crissman questioned if there was a way a bid could be opened and read prior to the deadline date and time. Mr. Wendle answered that it could not happen. He noted that only the contractor could review his bid up until the time the bids are due. Mr. Shannon noted that a 2007 State law permitted the use of electronic bidding, and that PENNDOT does a lot of their bidding using this method. Mr. Stine noted that Second Class Townships could use the process, but he did not think that other municipal entities, such as the Authority could use it. Mr. Stine noted that he would have to look into this.

Mr. Weaver noted that the Board previously approved the ARA Bid but there was a question concerning pipe bursting for the project. He explained that he located an old PENNDOT drawing and determined that the pipes were not encased in concrete. Mr. Shannon noted that the Township dug a test pit and the results agreed with the drawings. Mr. Weaver noted that he could pipe burst the project and save \$250,000.

Solicitors Report

Mr. Stine noted that he is awaiting Judge Turgeon's decision on the lawsuit filed by South Hanover Township. He noted that the Sheesley condemnations are also before Judge Turgeon.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Blain made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 7:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by:

Authority Secretary
Gary A. Crissman