

**LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP AUTHORITY  
RE-ORGANIZATIONAL and BUSINESS MEETING  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2015**

**Call to Order**

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

Authority members present were William C. Seeds, Sr., William B. Hawk, William L. Hornung, David B. Blain, Robin Lindsey, and Justin Eby. Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; William Weaver, Sewer Authority Director; Steven Stine, Authority Solicitor; Mark Hilson, Authority Engineer; Jeff Wendle, Kevin Shannon, Mellissa Smith, Alton Whittle, Barry Wampler, Mary Jo Brown, Amanda Stank, and Mitch Collins, GHD Engineering Services; and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

**Pledge of Allegiance**

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

**Election of Chairman of the Board**

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

**Election of Vice Chairman**

Mr. Hawk made a motion to nominate David Blain as Vice Chairman. Mr. Eby seconded the motion. The nominations were closed. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

### **Election of Secretary**

Mr. Blain made a motion to nominate William L. Hornung as Secretary. Mr. Eby seconded the motion. The nominations were closed. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

### **Election of Treasurer**

Mr. Blain made a motion to nominate William Hawk as Treasurer. Ms. Lindsey seconded the motion. The nominations were closed. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

### **Election of Assistant Secretary**

Mr. Blain made a motion to nominate Robin Lindsey as Assistant Secretary. Mr. Eby seconded the motion. The nominations were closed. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

### **Appointment of Solicitor**

Mr. Blain made a motion to appoint the Law Offices of Steven Stine as Authority Solicitor. Ms. Lindsey seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

### **Appointment of Engineer**

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

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

Mr. Seeds noted that the next meetings would be May 26<sup>th</sup>, August 25<sup>th</sup> and November 24<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Blain suggested that it would be appropriate with all the special meetings that have been scheduled in the past, noting that there are two Authority Board members who are not Supervisors that we have a standing monthly meeting that could be the 4<sup>th</sup> Tuesday of every month and if it is not needed, we could cancel it. He noted that it would be scheduled and

advertised. Mr. Eby concurred with Mr. Blain, noting that having a set schedule would allow him to block out time for a meeting, and it would not be scheduled five minutes prior to a Supervisors meeting. He noted that important information is conducted at these special meetings that need to be voted on. Mr. Wolfe made a suggestion that it might be better to schedule a meeting on the first three Tuesday's of the month because typically the extra meetings run no more than a half an hour. Mr. Blain noted that it fine; he would just like to have a regularly scheduled meeting time, and if we don't need to meet, we can cancel it.

Mr. Wolfe questioned if five o'clock before the workshop would be too early. Mr. Eby noted that he could not be present before 5:20 p.m. Mr. Wolfe suggested making it 6 p.m. before the third meeting of the month, providing an hour and a half if needed.

Mr. Blain made a motion to approve the regular Authority quarterly meeting for the fourth Tuesdays, May 26th, August 25<sup>th</sup> and November 24th, at 6 p.m. and in the interim periods the meeting will be set for the third Tuesday of the month at 6 p.m. at the Municipal Center, on an as needed basis. Mr. Seeds questioned if it was okay with Mr. Weaver. Mr. Weaver answered yes. Mr. Wolfe noted that we do have a special Authority strategic planning meeting scheduled for Tuesday, March 24<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

## **BUSINESS MEETING**

### **Approval of Minutes**

Mr. Hawk made a motion to approve the February 5, 2015. Mr. Hornung seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

### **Public Comment**

No public comment was presented.

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

No Board member comments were presented.

### **Old Business**

There was no old business.

## **New Business**

### Resolution 15-02; establishing a tapping fee re-imburement part

Mr. Seeds noted that this resolution was pulled for action from the agenda.

Mr. Wendle noted that he would like to make a comment on this resolution. He noted that the reason why there is no action required, noting that this particular reimbursement tapping fee is to reimburse Donco Construction for construction of the Oakhurst Interceptor for work they did in Susquehanna Township that was completed a couple of years ago. He noted that it is now completed up to the pumping station.

Mr. Wendle noted that there were provisions in the agreement with Donco that both Susquehanna and Lower Paxton Township Authorities would charge a reimbursement tapping fee to reimburse Donco, less 5% for the administration costs for when people tied into using the line. He noted that Donco is currently considering using the amount listed but if he decides to develop his property with more units, then that amount would decrease. He suggested that he would know more by the March 24<sup>th</sup> meeting and should have a number that the Board can act upon.

Mr. Wendle thanked the Authority for the appointment to serve the Authority that was discussed during the November meeting. He explained, at this time, he would like to introduce his staff: Kevin Shannon and Mary Jo Brown who do the grant and permitting work. He noted that Mitch Collins is doing the hydraulic modeling work, joining the firm over a year ago. He introduced Alton Whittle and Amanda Stank who do a lot of the permitting work. He noted that Barry Wampler does the design and layout work. He noted that Melissa Smith works with Mr. Shannon to handle all the projects.

Mr. Seeds noted that he missed the approval of Exhibit A-14. Mr. Wendle noted that they were both approved in November and signed. Mr. Seeds suggested that they were approved on October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2014. Mr. Wendle noted that Exhibit A-1 was signed in November.

Mr. Weaver noted that the Engineer's agreement was forwarded to him by Mr. Whittle for the Board packet, and he received Exhibit A-1 from Mr. Wendle and Exhibit A-14 from Mr. Whittle but he did not see it in time for the meeting. He noted that Exhibit A-14 was discussed in December but was not formally approved. He noted that he wanted to make sure that the Board did review it and took formal action on it. He noted it is for the project management for the metering program for the installation and maintenance of additional meters required to do the

Beaver Creek Phase 2 metering program. He explained that staff would not be capable of doing all of that with all duties from the Paxton Creek and Spring Creek basins for the 90 meters that he has. He noted that GHD took on 19 meters for maintenance and installation of these metering sites. He noted that he is recommending Board approval. Mr. Seeds noted that he has a note that it was approved October 8<sup>th</sup> not to exceed \$39,700. Mr. Wendle noted that he has a signed document. Mr. Seeds suggested that we did this in December.

Resolution 15-03; establishing a sewer rental rate for the Municipal Landfill

Mr. Weaver noted that resolution 15-03 establishing a sewer rental rate for the Municipal landfill. He noted back in 2007, he reviewed the connection to the landfill and determined that the landfill actually ties into the joint use interceptor. He noted that during a lot of wet years, the landfill Township sewer costs were significant, \$300,000 to \$500,000 a year. He explained that after speaking with Mr. Wolfe it was thought to be reasonable to develop a calculation where the Township only pays their pro-rated share of the cost of the joint use interceptor and sewer facility that provides the treatment. He noted that Mr. Wendle established a rate in 2007 and it was revised in 2008; however, the Authority has never formally established a landfill rate by resolution and it has not been revised since 2008.

Mr. Weaver explained that the rate has gone up quite a bit due to the expansion of the Swatara Treatment Facility in 2011, with the Township needing to pay its pro-rated share of those costs. He noted that he provided the average for what they had last year, however, it was one of the wettest years on record. He explained that he did not think that it would be that significant of a cost in 2015. He noted in a very wet year we could see an increase of about \$35,000 a year.

Mr. Seeds questioned if it is the actual cost for Swatara to treat it. Mr. Weaver answered yes. Mr. Wendle noted that would be in addition to the cost of the debt service for the treatment plan expansion.

Mr. Seeds noted that the minimum is \$130 just like a residential quarterly rate. Mr. Weaver answered that is correct. Mr. Seeds questioned if the \$3.89 is for 1,000 gallon per day (GPD) all the way from zero up or is it after the 16,000 GPD. Mr. Weaver answered that it is calculated for after the 16,000 GPD. Mr. Weaver noted that the computer system established a minimum bill at 16,000 GPD and then the rate is calculated after that per EDU, so there is a minimum charge no matter what and after that it is calculated at the GPD rate.

Mr. Blain made a motion to establish a sewer rental rate for the Municipal Landfill. Ms. Lindsey seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Resolution 15-04; authorizing the condemnation for a temporary Construction easement for the Crum's Lane/PC-4E Mini Basin Project

Mr. Weaver noted that the Board had seen these construction easements resolution many times before. He noted that it is for the Crums Lane project where he issued a change order to Joao Bradley to do the sewer work ahead of the storm water project that will be done in the spring. He noted that he is still waiting for the Hess property to provide a construction easement and his recommendation is to approve Resolution 15-04 so Mr. Stine can make any efforts needed to acquire the easement.

Mr. Blain made a motion to approve Resolution 15-04; authorizing the condemnation for a temporary easement for the Crum's Lane/PC-4E mini basin project. Mr. Eby seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Approval of a temporary construction easement for Ronald E. and Gretchen M. Dickey, parcel 35-044-029 for sanitary sewer work

Mr. Weaver explained that he added this to the agenda for the Crums Mill project. He noted that Mr. Dickey has an attorney and he has contacted the Authority as Mr. Dickey was upset when the trees were cleared for the right-of-way that he did not get to keep the timber. He noted that the timber was hauled away and since that time he has made arrangements for Mr. Dickey to get some timber, however he has a shed in the sewer right-of-way. He noted that is not permitted as part of the sanitary sewer easement. He noted that the attorney for Mr. Dickey was very reasonable and said we will forgo any damages for the loss of timber and the possibility of some trespass complaints that were never validated, noting that Mr. Wetzel stated that they may have gone outside the easement. He noted that it turned out to be a very easy solution as Mr. Dickey wanted the shed moved out of the easement into the temporary easement and have a pad established for the shed to be placed on. He noted that Mr. Hilson inspected the site and noted that although it is a challenge, as no one wants to move the shed, that staff, with Mr. Hilson's assistance should be able to move the shed. He noted that Mr. Stine was fine with Mr. Shall providing the temporary easement agreement for consideration and the Dickey's have signed it. He noted that he and Mr. Stine recommend that the Board approve this easement.

Mr. Seeds noted that no one has had a chance to read it as they just got it today. He questioned if we had an agreement for the trees with Mr. Dickey. Mr. Weaver answered no, we had a permanent sewer easement noting that he needs a temporary easement to provide some additional space to replace the sewer and store material. He noted that it is standard to get a ten foot temporary easement on the side of the 30 foot easement. He noted that Mr. Wetzel worked with the contractor to get the right-of-way cleared because we want to get the work done before spring as it gets wet in that location. He noted that they cleared the right-of-way and Mr. Dickey was not notified of the clearing and he was upset as he wanted to keep the timber. He suggested that this is a reasonable solution to move the shed as it is a big effort.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Shall is the attorney involved in the project. Mr. Weaver answered yes. Mr. Seeds questioned if you will get a letter of agreement from Mr. Dickey. Mr. Weaver answered that the easement is the agreement.

Mr. Blain made a motion to approve a temporary construction easement for Ronald E. and Gretchen M. Dickey for parcel 35-044-029 for sanitary sewer work. Mr. Hornung seconded the motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

## **Township Reports**

### Review of GHD Paving Costs Analysis

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wendle prepared an analysis for preparation for the final compensation change order for Doli Construction for the BC-6 project and also for the Joao Bradley project for PC-5. He noted that Mr. Hornung, at the last Board meeting asked Mr. Wolfe to provide information if we were getting a good value on the paving quantities that are in the sewer contracts. He noted that he provided a brief summary of what staff and GHD has done to get an answer for that question. He noted that staff and GHD believe that bidding the paving as part of the sewer contract is recommended and will receive the best value for the Township. He noted that additional paving quantities were required for the additional improvements needed to the roads that fall apart when the sewer replacement project is done. He noted that Ms. Smith and GHD provided a comparison of the paving costs to the other low bidders that is included in the packet. He noted that it was Mr. Hilson's idea to do this, and it showed that we were getting a good value. He noted that we looked at what the Township is getting for paving costs, and the numbers are very close. He noted in the long run, the sewer replacement contracts are getting good values.

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Hilson will have two large change orders to present in March and he hopes to eliminate these with the additional trench width in the new specifications for the wider trench as it was at seven feet and will now be 15 feet. He noted at Mr. Wolfe's suggestion they are also taking paving cores, and he thinks that he can eliminate or minimize the change orders in the future.

Mr. Seeds questioned if you will be going to 30 foot trenches. Mr. Weaver answered that it will be 15 feet. He noted that the standard that is used in the industry around the country is five feet with a two foot cutback, but using 15 feet provides enough paving to prepare the street. He noted that this will be the heart of the discussion during the strategic planning meeting in March, the cost involved with the change orders and the additional program costs for paving. He noted that the discussion will involve what are the best options for what the Board is looking to do long term.

Review status of Second Consent Decree mini-basin construction projects/bond schedule

Mr. Weaver noted he would like to review with the Board his memo for the sewer design for BC-4, the Jonestown Road sycamore tree removal involving the sewer location to the center of Jonestown Road. He noted that staff has received a request from the property owner at 6290 Jonestown Road to keep her sycamore trees. He noted that Mrs. Bailey is present to discuss this further. He explained that GHD has followed Mrs. Bailey's request and prepared a cost comparison.

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Wolfe is displaying the proposed design. He noted that the existing location is shown in red and the new design is in green, however it would cost an additional \$7,257. He noted that staff is asking for a recommendation for how to proceed with the design since they have received a request from the property owner.

Mr. Weaver explained that he requested Mr. Norm Laccase from the Shade Tree Commission to discuss this with the engineer and staff and to make a recommendation. He noted that he met with him this afternoon and he provided the technical aspect of whether or not you can keep the trees. He noted that his recommendation was to remove the trees. He noted that the general rule for the distance that the sewer should be away from the tree is one foot per every inch of diameter for the tree. He noted that the trees are 31 to 32 inches in diameter; therefore the sewer line should be about 30 feet from the trees, which is the width of the cart path. He noted that the green line shown on the map would not be a sufficient distance away

from the trees to protect the trees and the sewer cannot be relocated to the other side of the street as you have storm sewer issues and other issues as well. He noted that Mr. Laccase's recommendation is to remove the trees. He questioned Mr. Laccase if that was the standard that he would use, but what about the option of redesigning the sewer if the Board decides that they are willing to do that. He noted that the Authority could install the sewer line and determine if it encounters any roots. He noted if we don't encounter any roots then there would be no danger to the trees so we could consider redesigning the sewer. He noted that Mr. Laccase also mentioned that due to the size of the canopy of the tree, it is a good indication of how far the roots go. He noted that he has two systems for analysis, one is the tree diameter and the second is the canopy dimension and if the roots have a way to get there, it will get to where it wants.

Mr. Weaver explained that the roads built today are 97% to 100% compaction, so if the road was compacted with material then the roots couldn't get in underneath, but Mr. Hilson point out that all these roads were built with concrete back in the 1940's or 1950's. He noted that it was eight to ten feet wide and now it is 25 feet to 30 feet wide. He noted that the area closest to the houses may still have some previous root intrusion as these trees could be 70 years old. He noted that the trees were in place when the sewer was installed.

Mr. Seeds noted when they redid the square in Linglestown to install the roundabout that concrete was over two foot thick. He noted that you could run into the same issues for this as it is an old PennDOT road. Mr. Hilson explained that he took core samplings on the road and the concrete section was six inches but it was underneath eight inches of paving. He noted that we learned a lot by drilling the road and taking samples. He noted that it is not 14 inches across the entire width of the road since it was widened over the years toward the sycamore trees.

Mr. Blain noted that the red line is the existing line and you are proposing to put the sewer line out ten feet from the current one. He noted that Mr. Laccase is saying if you dig that area and put a new sewer line in you could hit the roots. He questioned what the bigger issue is for the Township. He noted if the trees die, they are on Mrs. Bailey property or are they in the right-of-way. Mr. Weaver answered that they are within the sewer easement. He noted that the property owner owns the trees and they could keep the trees. He noted if we don't hit any roots there would be no risk of damage to the tree; however Mr. Laccase stated that it would be a reasonable approach. He noted that he was trying to come up with a solution as the property owner wants to keep the trees. He noted that Mr. Laccase strongly recommends, if the Board would choose that alternative, that the property owner knows that the trees should come down as

these kind of trees don't belong in the right-of-way, they are too big, and the Shade Tree Commission does not plant trees in the right-of-way. He noted if they have to do that, they protect them with a root guard that is 18 inches around the root system to prevent root issues. He noted that Mr. Laccase recommended to take the trees down but he was not opposed to trying to replace the sewer to see what we found.

Ms. Lindsey questioned how far would you would have to dig before you would know that there are roots. Mr. Hilson answered that they dig the full depth so he would know right away if they would hit roots from the first tree. He noted that after that it would be almost impossible to tell what root we are hitting from what tree. He noted if we hit no roots that approach would work, but two of the trees that are on the aerial picture showed health issues as there is dead wood. He noted those trees should come down as they are already diseased. He explained that Mrs. Bailey wants to keep the first three trees from the corner as they form a natural barrier from the traffic and provide shade and add character to her home.

Mr. Weaver questioned Mr. Laccase why they would have planted those trees there 70 years ago and his response was that they did not have cars, they had horses.

Mr. Seeds questioned if we could move the mainline further into the road. Mr. Hilson answered from the construction standpoint, he was trying to keep one lane of traffic open during the construction and if you put it in the center of the road, we would lose the opportunity to keep the road open during construction and we would get more into the concrete road section to the point where he would not want to leave a thin strip of the concrete under the road. He noted that it will break up and propagate up through the paving. He explained that we do not want to get fully into the concrete subsurface so we would not have to take all 14 inches out as it would be extremely costly and we are trying to keep at least one direction of the road open during the day during construction.

Mr. Seeds questioned if we put the sewer line in the red or the green and saved the trees, and a year from now the trees die, who would be responsible to take the trees down. Mr. Hilson noted that the red line cannot be installed keeping the trees in place. He noted that the trees would have to come out if we used the red line. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Laccase made a suggestion about that, noting that currently we provide homeowners with a tree waiver, and if the sewer is replaced and they choose to keep the tree, we require them to sign a waiver; however, Mr. Laccase pointed out if the property is sold then the waiver does not continue with the property. He noted what we have been doing for the past few years should be revisited and he

would takes Mr. Laccase's recommendation that Mr. Stine be given permission to record the waivers. Mr. Seeds noted that the waiver provides that the property owner is responsible for the trees and the removal of them if they become a hazard. Mr. Weaver noted that the new policy would be that the property owner would be responsible for the removal of the trees since Mr. Stine would record the waiver. Mr. Stine answered that he could do that, but the document would have to be notarized.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if we have ever had this issue before. Mr. Wolfe answered not to this extent. Mr. Hornung noted that we had an issue on Valley Road. Mr. Weaver suggested that they relocated the sewer to save some trees, but it was put back further on the property and not in the roadway. Mr. Hilson noted that we run into this a lot with private sewers but not with mainlines.

Mr. Weaver noted for the next project, the contract calls to remove 160 trees. He noted explained that he needs a decision tonight as they are getting ready to put the tree services out to bid. He noted that is part of the BC-4 project. He noted that the property owners next to Mrs. Bailey all want the trees removed. He noted that she is the only one who wants to keep the trees, as she has three trees. Mrs. Baily stated that the damaged trees belong to the neighbors and she would be happy to see those removed.

Mr. Weaver noted that the neighbors trees should come down, he noted that those roots can still get into the sewer and if the property owner wants them down, Mr. Hilson stated that they should be removed.

Mr. Seeds noted that sycamore trees are noted for growing to water.

Mr. Eby questioned what size main line are you replacing. Mr. Weaver answered that it is eight inches. Mr. Eby questioned if it was televised. Mr. Hilson answered that he thinks that it was and Mr. Wetzel did not find significant root intrusion but there is some.

Mr. Eby questioned if there were any complaints for site distances by drivers in that area. Mr. Wolfe answered no. Mr. Weaver noted that the Traffic Safety Unit from the Police Department looked at it and they had no issues.

Mr. Eby questioned if the original costs has the root removal for the trees. Mr. Weaver answered yes.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if the decision was made to use the green line and we find that there are roots and revert to the red line, how would that work with the homeowner. She noted at that point she does not have a choice and questioned if she had to sign something. Mr. Weaver

noted that we would just stay in the green path, and if roots were found, the trees would have to come down. He noted that there would have to be an agreement for that, something other than the waiver.

Mr. Eby questioned if the root system for sycamore trees go down or across. Mr. Weaver answered that Mr. Laccase told him that with most all trees you have a three foot tap root but most roots spread out to stabilize the tree and provide nutrients. Mr. Stine noted that almost of the roots of any tree are within a couple of feet of the surface. Mr. Hilson noted that they are normally within 16 inches of the surface but he has dug sewer and found roots down ten feet and in the sewer for 30 feet.

Mr. Weaver explained that best tree root story that he had heard is where the tree root when down the lateral and down the main in the area near the Municipal Center. He noted that the homeowner cut the lateral and the plumber was pulling out roots for fifteen minutes, just one long string.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mrs. Bailey had anything to add. Mrs. Bailey noted that she loves her shade trees as they provide protection from vehicles that hit the trees instead of her house. She noted with using the green design if you start digging and you find the roots and they have to come out that is fine. She noted that she understands that. She noted that she did not want to chop them down right away.

Mr. Seeds explained if we did that would the rest of the trees be removed. Mr. Weaver answered yes. Mr. Seeds questioned if that is possible. Mr. Weaver answered that the tree contractor would have no issue taking down the other five trees.

Mr. Blain noted that a sycamore tree is popular as a street tree and as an ornamental. He noted that they typically grow 75 to 90 feet in height and spread 50 to 75 feet with their roots. Mr. Weaver questioned how deep the roots grow. Mr. Blain noted that the tree root system is shallow with most roots growing close to the surface. Mrs. Bailey noted that she has a lot of root surface on her side in the grass. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Laccase stated that the roots are probably not deep but since there is not a lot of pavement there is a good chance that the roots grew under the street and probably go all the way to the other side of the street. Mr. Blain noted that the information states that they spread 50 to 70 feet. Mr. Weaver noted that there is a good chance that they will hit the roots. He noted that he wanted to provide an option in fairness to the homeowner.

Mr. Wendle questioned how they built the original sewer.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Laccase loves to save trees if he can, and he is surprised but if he says they should come down, it is a good decision. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Laccase offered to plant two new trees for Mrs. Baily. Mrs. Baily asked what kind and how big would they be. She noted if they are only so tall and a car hits them, will they replace them with every car accident. Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Laccase would recommend a tree for Mrs. Bailey.

Mr. Blain noted that many factors affect root growth including soil type and water availability. He noted that tightly packed soil can inhibit root growth while a deep water table could force roots to bore farther down to find nutrients. He noted if a sycamore has ample space the roots will spread laterally, however if the tree is constricted by roads, sidewalks, or obstacles, the roots may instead be forced downward. Mr. Hilson questioned if that is downward towards the sewer.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Weaver would be offering trees to the other homeowners. Mr. Weaver answered if they ask for them. He noted that the Township's policy for sewer replacement program is we don't offer the trees, noting that we are taking down 150 trees, and have taken down thousands in the last ten years; the only time we provide a tree is when the property owner requests it. He noted that it happens about 25% of the time. Mr. Eby noted that a lot of trees came down in Heatherfield.

Mr. Blain noted that the root depth is usually no more than six feet, around three to six feet.

Mr. Hilson noted that he will pull the first manhole that is eastbound on Jonestown Road and stay further away from the first tree. He noted if we decided to go with the green route, then if we hit roots it is clear as to the criteria for removing the trees. He questioned if it included hitting any roots for the trees to come down, or must it be significant; who judges that. He questioned how we determine that so that we are not trying to figure it out later in the field.

Mr. Blain questioned if we should have Mr. Laccase present when you are digging the trench. Mr. Weaver answered that he said he could be present and look at what roots are in the way. Mr. Hornung questioned if this work would damage the trees. Mr. Weaver answered that he said the number one issue is safety. He noted that he would take no chance. Mr. Hornung noted if we develop the green design, did he think that it would disturb the trees. Mr. Weaver answered that he can't tell due to the compaction, he noted if it is compacted well, the roots may not get through but it may have gotten under the existing road. He noted that Mr. Laccase is not against trying this... Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Laccase's issue is a safety issue from the

perspective that the sewer authority will be out there digging a trench and hitting roots and those roots stabilize the tree so if those roots are gone and they die, the tree may survive for a number of years to come but you may have instability of that tree, and a strong wind storm could up root the tree. Mr. Weaver noted if the Board considers the green route and are in agreement with the property owner that the Township would have the right, as soon as it hits the roots, to authorize the contractor, for safety reasons, to take the trees down immediately. He noted that he could stop the contractor and there would be some damages or we can allow them to continue...Mr. Hilson noted that the contractor would continue, and Mr. Laccase would be present and he would have whoever is awarded the mini-basin's tree removal contract to remove the trees.

Mr. Weaver noted that there is a reasonable solution and he would recommend that the Board go with the green option to take all the trees down except the Bailey's three trees and have the solicitor prepare an agreement to allow the trees to come down if the project hits tree routes. Ms. Lindsey noted that she agrees with that.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the line definitely needs to be replaced. Mr. Weaver answered that it qualifies by the type, noting that we have to remove all ACP.

Mr. Seeds noted that this will be expensive no matter how we do it. He noted that the tree removal will be very expensive. Mr. Weaver noted that he got a price quote of \$11,000 for all the trees.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if they take the tree the whole way down to the ground. Mr. Hilson answered that they will grind the stump.

Mr. Seeds noted that there are no sidewalks on that side. Mr. Wolfe answered that they are located across the street.

Ms. Lindsey suggested that we should follow Mr. Weaver's recommendation, use the green design and if staff hit the roots and Ms. Bailey is okay with that, as long as we have something drawn up by Mr. Stine and Mrs. Baily is willing to sign it. She noted that we won't know until we get there and you would hate to take the trees down only to find out that there was no problem. Mr. Hawk seconded Ms. Lindsey's motion. Mr. Seeds called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed. Mrs. Bailey thanked everyone for the discussion.

Mr. Hilson noted that there were three sewer replacement projects ongoing in the last quarter. He noted that PACT Construction was working at Gale Drive and they finished all but one building sewer so the pipe is done but there is a lot of restoration to be done. He noted that

there is a lot of paving and yard restoration to be completed. He noted that he has one building sewer to talk about but it will be done during Executive Session.

Mr. Hilson noted that the second project involves Michael F. Ronca and Sons working to decommission the Waste Water Treatment Plant, remove it from the site and also wrap up Trunk G. He noted that the pipe line work on that job is done and there is some restoration items outstanding.

Mr. Hilson noted that we had an ongoing project in the BC-3A & 3B area in the Blue Streets. He noted that the contractor happens to be a brother of Michael F. Ronca and they finished their first work zone, although they were late. He noted that they had a milestone deadline date and he is in discussion about damages in regards to that. He noted that they are working through work zone No. 2. He noted that this month has become quite a factor due to the cold weather as it has been exceptionally cold and frost is continuing to penetrate. He noted that it makes an issue with backfill material. He noted that the stone dries out tremendously due to the cold, but they are making progress and working five days a week.

Ms. Lindsey noted on the Gale Drive project on Mark Avenue, what happened as they were hitting a lot of water mains. Mr. Hilson noted that it is very frustrating for folks, it is hard for the residents as they are out of water, and they don't understand why this happens. He noted that the United Water mains are predominately asbestos cement pipe (PCP) and they do not have a good way to get a good location for their pipes. He noted many times their records will show that the pipe is on one side of the street and we are working on the other side of the street and he starts digging and hits the water main on the wrong side of the street. He noted that most of the outages were due to that. He noted that occasionally the original builder of the house put the sewer and the water line touching each other. He noted that it is very hard with an older water line to get the sewer replaced trying not to hit it and many times it breaks. He noted in many instances the water line does not break right away but it starts to leak after we have paved the roadway. He noted that we had those instances occur in the PC-5D&5E project with Joao Bradley where we paved and the next day it leaked. He noted that they are old main lines, ACP and it starts to get soft and is naturally brittle and is difficult to work with. He noted that when we are working on the surface paving and the vibration from running the roller to compact the material will break the main. He noted that it is very frustrating for us and we try our best to explain to the residents what is going on. He noted that people assume that it is contractor incompetence that breaks the main. He noted that once in a while that may occur but most times

they have no expectation that the pipe is there. He noted that it is not metal pipe and very hard to locate.

Mr. Weaver noted that we go in and work on the roads noting that they are 50 to 60 years old but they weren't built to today's standards. He noted when we go to replace the sewer lines the roads fall apart. He noted that it is the same thing with the ACP noting that it is 40 or 50 years old and the water company has no money, they have \$1 million for the entire State of Pennsylvania. Mr. Hilson noted that it is frustrating because you would think as a utility it should be incumbent upon them to maintain pipe and replace pipe such that if you do have to pave the road or replace another utility that their utility isn't just going to fall apart. He noted that their perception is if the Authority did not touch the road, their pipe would be fine.

Mr. Weaver noted that the Board needs to know, as we move forward with this program in the future, there will be a lot more like this. He noted that design-wise they can do test pits to see if there are crossing problems but to do test pit to find the waterlines for the entire Township, it would cost millions. He noted that United Water can't even do it. He noted that there is no way to ask Mr. Hilson or GHD to find a better way to find the lines before we start digging. He noted that only a small percentage of the problem is the result of carelessness.

Mr. Eby questioned if you put a no-dig for five year where you notify a utility that you are replacing sewer and that you will pave the road, so that they will not dig into a newly paved road. Mr. Wolfe noted that there is an ordinance if they come in and the road has been repaved within a certain period of time, if they disturb a certain percentage, they have to completely overlay. He noted that staff is looking at tightening up the ordinance but to have a no-dig provision would be impractical as we have water lines breaking all the time in different locations. Mr. Eby noted that some boroughs and townships put it in that unless it is an emergency, we are notifying you that this work will be done, therefore you should get your work done beforehand. Mr. Wolfe answered that we do a coordination with the water company and there have been areas, such as BC-1 where they installed the water line and we installed sewer line and then the entire road was replaced. He noted that was the ultimate win-win situation that rarely happens.

Mr. Eby noted that sometimes people want natural gas after the road was just paved. Mr. Hilson noted that has occurred. Mr. Weaver noted that the gas company contacts the Township every year and asks where we will be working. Mr. Hilson noted that he provides a list of all the streets that we will be paving in the next year and they try to change their schedule to be ahead of

us but it also prompts them to buy things that will be needed for the pavement programs such as valves and other items. Mr. Hilson explained that we have delayed paving road because United Water would play around with the idea of doing something and we hold off and then they pull the trigger on it and don't do their work.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the package plant is completely gone. Mr. Hilson answered yes. Mr. Seeds questioned if there was anything worth selling. Mr. Hilson answered no because we could not get it out of the site in one piece so the only value was scrap. He noted it was a bid project and the low bid would have included the value of the scrape to the contractor.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the land reverted back to D'Souza or was it always his land. Mr. Hilson answered that it will as soon as we are finished with the restoration. Mr. Seeds noted that the Township had to pay back taxes on it. Mr. Stine explained that the Authority only had a lease with them, he noted that there is no reverting, he owns it. Mr. Stine noted that we paid the back taxes on it as it was part of the agreement to pay the utilities but now that the plant is gone, we don't pay anything.

Mr. Seeds questioned if contractors are still doing work on Gale Drive. Mr. Hilson answered that they are still working there. Mr. Seeds noted that everything is gravity now in that area. Mr. Hilson answered yes.

#### Update on Bond Funds and Authority Cash Reserve Investments

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Hornung requested staff to provide some investment options for the surplus funds. He noted that based on GHD's rate schedules a significant amount of the fund will be available for investment. He noted that the rate table shows if you do a 25% reserve, having \$11 million, you would still have \$7 million that you could invest for some time. He noted that it is not currently being invested, although Ms. Knoll has a small amount of funds with Fulton Financial Advisors, about \$1.4 million. He noted the he asked Ms. Knoll to provide a recommendation for the Board to consider and she has done that.

Mr. Weaver explained that Ms. Knoll provided a few options for the Board to consider such as Fulton Financial Advisors, PA Treasurer's INVSET program and PLIGT. She noted that the Authority already has a relationship with Fulton and the PA School District Liquid Asset Fund has a good record. He noted that the Board could choose to do a RFP but banks generally don't respond to RFP's as they won't collateralize the debt. He noted that staff recommends you

consider the options provided and split the funds between two agencies to invest the money long-term for five to seven years.

Mr. Seeds questioned how much money is involved in this. Mr. Weaver answered that there is \$11 million but to keep the reserve we could invest up to \$7 million and staff was recommending investing \$6 million to start.

Mr. Blain questioned if anyone has asked Susquehanna Advisors, since they are the Township financial advisors what they think about investing and where it should be invested. He noted that there may be other options that the Authority could use. Mr. Weaver noted that we can do that. Mr. Wolfe noted that it wouldn't hurt to do that. Mr. Seeds suggested that Mr. Weaver or Mr. Wolfe should make contact with them.

Mr. Hornung noted that sometimes there are other ways to get the job done with less fees. Mr. Wolfe noted no matter where you go you will not make a lot of money as you are restricted to governmental investments which are earning a percent or less at this time. Mr. Weaver noted that fees are a big issue and that the next item to discuss is PLIGT with the bond investments. He noted that they do a good job for us but the fees are high. He explained that they are not high but the same as everyone else, but it takes a big chunk of your earnings since the earnings are so small. He noted the way the market is now, your benefitting from the low rates on the bond money but the investment part does not have much out there.

Mr. Weaver noted that Ms. Knoll provided some interest rates, noting that the one option had a few rates but the other one was just general information.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Hornung what we should do. Mr. Hornung answered that we should check with Mr. Wenger to see what his fees are like, and get an answer back from Fulton Financial Advisors to see what their fees are like. He noted that Mr. Wenger may do it for a lot less money due to the relationship with the Township or he may not. He noted with such a low interest rate the fees kill you. He questioned if we could invest the funds ourselves. Mr. Weaver answered yes we can. Mr. Blain suggested that you could take it to M&T Bank. Mr. Weaver answered that you can't take it to a bank as they won't collateralize it. Mr. Wolfe noted that you have to go out to multiple banks and collateralize the investment. Mr. Weaver noted that the investment fees are different for the brokers so it comes down to who has the best fee structure.

Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Wenger is not a money manager, but he could provide advice as to what may be the best option. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Wenger doesn't invest on behalf of clients. Mr. Blain noted that you are paying him to be your financial advisor and it would be

good to ask him for financial advice for what to do with the excess money. Mr. Weaver noted that personally, it is not his level of expertise as he only spends the money.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the money is earning nothing at this time. Mr. Weaver noted that it is in the checking account with PNC Bank except for the \$1.4 million that is with Fulton Financial Advisors. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would do more checking. Mr. Seeds noted that maybe he will have more information by the March meeting. He noted that he did not know how urgent it is to do this. Mr. Wolfe answered that he would like to get this done in the first quarter.

Mr. Weaver noted that the information on the bond investments is also included in the packet. He noted that he, Mr. Wolfe, Ms. Knoll and Mr. Wendle met with Brad and you can see what investments we are getting on those rates. He noted lastly one of the Board members asked about the arbitrage restrictions and that analysis has also been completed for the last year.

#### Summary of February 16<sup>th</sup> Swatara Authority annual meeting

Mr. Weaver explained that staff met with the Swatara Authority and staff at their regular annual meeting and it went very well. He noted that the Authority is scheduled to get back \$265,000 from the plant upgrades; however the permits are an issue. He noted that he provided more information to them and hopefully it went okay. He explained that he will be sending a letter to Chairman Spare after he gets an answer from Mr. Kerschner for how many permits will be returned. He noted that he will be asking for 168 permits. He noted that he and Mr. Wendle provided an update on the Beaver Creek Cap costs and that we are considering different alternatives that we will present to the Board with GHD, which will be the focus of the March meeting.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Weaver had enough information for Mr. Spare and the Board because you haven't had a lot of wet weather events. Mr. Weaver answered that is correct. Mr. Seeds noted that a lot of the metering is not completed so you did not have the reports that they were looking for. Mr. Weaver answered that it is a big issue and the frustration with Swatara is we just got the program started. He noted that last year was a record precipitation year. He noted that we had 46 inches of rain in the year and Swatara is looking like jeez wait, you guys are supposed to be doing this work and it is getting worse. He noted that is because we had a significant wet year. He noted that Mr. Spare is saying that he has to answer to the rest of his Board members for what is happening as they want results.

Mr. Weaver noted that he anticipated this in the settlement agreement and that he, Mr. Wendle and Mr. Stine worked on, with Scott Wyland. He noted that he pointed out to Mr. Spare

it is in the agreement to provide some analysis of how the program is doing in other area and what those removals can be and what we can expect in BC-6. He noted after further consideration we decided to give them the data as we have tons of it from PC and SC. He noted that the data Mr. Wendle provided to them is what was included in the packet.

Mr. Whittle noted that the answer to the original question is that there has not been a significant event to merit... Mr. Seeds noted that even though you stated that we had over 40 inches of rain, it was steady, you did not have three or four inches at one time. Mr. Weaver answered that it happened all between January and May and we did not complete this project until after April or May. Mr. Whittle noted that the annual report is done from July through June and since July of 2014 we have not had a measurable event to evaluate.

Mr. Hornung questioned if Actiflo is still alive. Mr. Wendle reported during the meeting that he has been concerned for some time due to the increased paving costs as it is running 35% of the total costs for replacement. He noted unless we come up with a solution to deal with the roads that were originally substandard that we are now making them way beyond what they were, unless we come up with a compromise like we did in PC-5C to provide a smaller base that will still hold up in a neighborhood, the costs will continue to escalate as they are substantial. He noted that we will have to do something other than replacement as there was always storage in the plans for the future but the question is how small we can make it. He noted that we are shrinking the size of the storage need each year in Paxton Creek. He noted when we first started to work with Swatara Authority, noting that our relationship is much better now than it was, their attitude was that they would do nothing at the plant to take care of the Township's I&I.

Mr. Wendle noted there is a huge challenge in spending hundreds of millions of dollars to come up with a process to meet the State's requirement of biological treatment and Actiflo came up with a solution called Bio-Actiflo. He noted in front of the Actiflo plant, they put a small contact tank where you recirculate sludge, a quick contact period, go through the Actiflo process, recombine it with the outflow of the treatment plant and it would become part of the treatment plant's permit. He stated to the Swatara Township Authority if they would not look at it he would not look into it, but if they told him that they would consider looking into it, he would do some preliminary numbers to see what it would be. He noted that their answer was that they stated that they would look at it. He noted in March he will have some preliminary numbers to look at. He explained that his company is designing a fairly large active biological Actiflo facility in Hanover County Maryland. He noted that it was supposed to be done in June, but the

contract is running behind and if the Board looked at pursuing this he could arrange for a tour of the facility as there are probably sixteen to twenty really big plants around the country. He noted that it is frustrating that in some places in the country they let you do it.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) is softening on this yet. Mr. Wendle answered that DEP would accept biological Actiflo because it is “biological”.

Mr. Weaver answered if there is a plant in Pennsylvania. Mr. Wendle answered that he did not think there is one in Pennsylvania. He noted with respect to the Paxton Creek, DEP has said that they would consider a ballast and settling process in the City of Harrisburg, but now they are very seriously thinking about it because it may be advantageous for Susquehanna and Lower Paxton Townships and the City of Harrisburg to share the costs. He noted that it gets more of their combined sewer into the system. Mr. Seeds questioned if it would be at the sewer plant. Mr. Wendle answered that it would be out somewhere as a satellite system on Cameron Street. He noted that Actiflo is in the mix, but especially in Beaver Creek, he was surprised that they are willing to consider it. He suggested that it may be a good long-term solution for the Township.

Mr. Hornung noted that you are discussing the road costs however, the Township is getting something so it is not just like it is a cost that does not have an advantage long-term. He noted that we have to keep that in mind that there is some return on that investment that we get back, he noted that he doesn't know how much or how you would determine what it would be if you only did a small amount versus repaving more than planned. He suggested that there is some responsibility on the Township's part to engage in that.

Mr. Hornung noted that he would be very happy to hear about Actiflo again as he always felt that was the answer for the Township. He noted that the hundreds of millions of dollars that we are putting in the ground needs to be slowed down, not done at all, or at a much later date by using Actiflo. Mr. Wendle noted that realizing you would get some return on it, but his concern was looking at the original program costs we need to determine what will be going out and have some real good strategy sessions to say this is where we are going forward if there are alternatives in the 20-year window.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the 35% was raised for the cost over \$2 per GPD. Mr. Wendle noted that it is higher than that and he will provide the range for the March meeting, looking forward to see the estimated costs for the basins for what the maximum potential of what

water you will be able to remove and the range of costs. He noted that it goes anywhere from \$2 to \$11 GPD. He noted that one of the \$11 ones can't be avoided as it is the Beaver Creek pumping station that we are trying to get under control. He noted that it has a wide range going forward.

#### Updated of the removal of wet weather grinder pumps

Mr. Weaver noted that we have removed three grinder pumps and have a few more to remove in 2016 and two more to study.

Ms. Lindsey noted by taking out the grinder pumps you are sure that they will not get water in their homes. Mr. Weaver answered yes.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if they are nervous when they agree to have the pumps removed. Mr. Weaver answered that they are as one property owner changed her mind noting that she wanted to keep it but after speaking with her neighbor she agreed to do it. He noted that speaking with Mr. Hilson helped to ease their mind.

Mr. Whittle noted that we are assured, short of an excused event. He noted when you have general flooding, that can cause sources of I&I to get in and it could cause a backup. Ms. Lindsey questioned if it would happen if they had the grinder pump. Mr. Whittle answered that the grinder pump would prevent any flooding.

#### Parkchester Road Pump Station Grease and Odor Complaints

Mr. Weaver noted that there have been some issues at the Parkchester Road Pump Station and the Township began to receive odor complaints. He noted that Mr. Hilson met with some of the homeowners. He completed a study of the ordinance and discovered that based on what Old Country Buffet is saying that we had to provide proof that the grease is coming from them and that we have a shortfall in the sewers at that location as there is no manhole that you can sample. He stated that staff will meet with Mr. Stine and GHD to come up with a plan. He suggested that he would be coming back in a week or two recommending that letters be sent to Old Country Buffet, Wendy's and Arby's to install as per our ordinance a sampling manhole. Mr. Seeds questioned if we can do it. Mr. Weaver answered that it is in the ordinance and it was preexisting before the restaurants were built noting that it was established in 1990 and the restaurants were built in 1993, 1995, and 1997.

Mr. Seeds questioned what about the grease traps. Mr. Weaver answered that they all have grease traps and Old Country Buffet had one outside. He explained when we built the new pump station, we took on the problem and had to put in a second trap. He noted that did not take care of the problem instead of having all the traps lined up, he suggested if they pump out the wet well every two weeks then the Authority wouldn't make Old Country Buffet install a trap. He noted that this has gone on for nine years and all of a sudden they decided that they would not honor the agreement anymore. He noted that they don't want to pump it as over time it became more expensive to do this. He noted that the Authority is paying it now at \$600 a pump.

Mr. Seeds questioned if they had grease traps within the kitchens. Mr. Weaver answered yes and also outside. Mr. Seeds questioned if they clean those traps. Mr. Weaver noted that we have about 150 to 200 restaurants and have no grease program as we don't have enough staff to do it. He noted that we may be coming back to the Board to have GHD see if they can provide someone or we may have to hire someone to go out and be a part-time grease inspector.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if it is done when the restaurants are inspected by the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Weaver noted that he will find out. Ms. Lindsey explained that they inspect her church's kitchen, noting that they were warned about it as they have a State License. Mr. Weaver noted that they may not in PA as he was told that there is no Health Department in PA. He suggested that the Department of Agriculture does not do it or we would not have grease problems. Mr. Hilson suggested that they may not do anything exterior. Ms. Lindsey noted that they look at it inside the facility, not outside. Mr. Hilson noted that these facilities produce so much grease that they have to have exterior grease traps. He suggested that Wendy's might have one.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Weaver will have more information on this for the March meeting.

### **Engineer's Report**

#### Review of revised sewer rates

Mr. Wendle noted that in addition to the graph and memo in the packet and a memo, he had two additional sheets to distribute to the Board members. He noted that the Board asked what the rate increase would be to allow for the 25% reserve, and so he came up with two graphs.

Mr. Wendle noted that Alternate One has two lines and it maintains 25% of the total projected expenses. He noted that we looked out 20 years at the borrowing, and inflated it to cover those costs, and it showed if you start out with 100% of the annual expenses it would drop and in the early 2030's it would drop down below the 25% reserve if you had \$8.50 a quarter increase. He noted that it would include the debt service.

Mr. Wendle noted that Alternate Two discusses applicable expenses, noting that the 2014 bond issue and 2015 requires the Authority to reserve 10% as coverage. He noted that he changed his annual amount that was shown in reserve so he changed it to a restricted reserve which was 10% of the bond issues and an unrestricted reserve which would be balance. He noted that debt service will not fluctuate so instead of keeping 25% of total expenses including debt service he suggested keeping 25% of the operating expenses that can fluctuate and 15% of the debt service. He noted that is what the three-line graph shows. He noted that you can meet that requirement with \$8.25 annual increase. He noted that it shows that at some point in the future once these projects are done, you will start giving money back to the residents so his recommendation would be once we have the March 24<sup>th</sup> meeting, and determine what we want to do going forward, that you sit down with a financial advisor and do what Gary Crissman wants to do; to keep things level. He noted in the early years when many of the bond issues will be paid back, finance so that you would be doing interest only for a while and delay the payment outs further in order to even out the trough and you will not have to increase the rates as high and then bring them back down again in the future. He noted that you may not have to raise the rates \$8.50 a quarter if you had some good financial expertise which is not his area of expertise.

PC Basin Storage Volumes Memo and Attachments  
and Storage discussions with Triple Crown

Mr. Shannon noted that the first part of the Engineer's Report covered the Annual Report that is submitted to DEP in June of every year and the metering program, wet weather investigations, modeling and a lot of stuff that Mr. Whittle's group does. He noted that he wanted to show this as a lead into the March meeting, noting that we will be talking about the Beaver Creek basin, but he wanted to discuss the progress of the Paxton Creek halfway through the 15 year period from 2007 to 2022. He stated that he put three exhibits together noting that a picture is worth a thousand words.

Mr. Whittle noted for the Paxton Creek basin, all the gray dots are historical locations where overflows have occurred. He noted that it is important to point out that we are very happy

with the elimination of the Gale Drive Pumping Station. He noted that there is a single location that still overflowed in the Paxton Creek this last year that has not been addressed. He noted that it may be a localized grease issue along with the restaurants that may be causing it. He noted from his standpoint, this is one of the major steps in trying to achieve what you set out to do in Paxton Creek for removing overflows. He noted that we had overflows over a large portion of Paxton Creek and last year it was reduced to two and now with the removal of the Gale Drive Pumping Station we are down to one. He noted that it is a very positive measure of how you are doing in Paxton Creek. Mr. Shannon noted that Paxton Creek is the red area and Beaver Creek is the green area.

Mr. Shannon noted that the second exhibit shows previous storm events in Paxton Creek noting that the red lines are the historical events, and the blue lines show the current events and how much you are over your limit. He noted for the Paxton Creek as a whole, you have reduced the number and intensity of storms that would result in overages.

Mr. Wendle questioned if the blue dots to the right, are at 12.57. Mr. Weaver answered yes. He noted that we are reading Paxton Creek in two locations, manhole 620 and manhole 99.05, the one that had four different names over a two-year period due to the differences in Susquehanna Township's numbering system from Lower Paxton Township's numbering on Valley Road. He noted that after this year the Authority will have three points leaving Paxton Creek noting that it is another positive trend in how much flow you have moved out in Paxton Creek.

Mr. Whittle noted that the third display is what you have typically seen in the reports showing what level of storm it takes to have overflows. He noted that this charts represents Beaver and Paxton Creek, but if you were to separate it out you can see how there are three lines on the left side showing significant, extreme and flood level events. He noted all the lines jump up, historically everything green was a minor overflow, and the second line was a system overflow and the top line is what it took to be a system-wide general flooding or state of emergency. He noted in that last couple of years these lines all increase with the removal of the Gale Drive pump station. He noted what was historically required to be a state of emergency is not what it would be. He noted that historically all the events at the bottom where we had overflows, if they would have occurred today, they would not. He noted since 2000, there has probably been 35 or 40 events that we would not have had if they would have occurred today. He noted that we are making great progress in PC and significant improvements since we really

made the 2007 decision and started doing things. He noted that he will include these items in next year's DEP annual report but he wanted the Board to see how successful the Township has been before Mr. Wendle makes his presentation in March.

Mr. Shannon noted that we have been looking at where we think we should go with Paxton Creek moving forward. He noted that we are looking to estimate the costs per gallon removed to show how it is getting more expensive and look to see if storage would be more cost effective. He noted that he is reprioritizing the remaining basins in Paxton Creek based on a number of criteria that we are looking at and we should be able to discuss this in March. He noted that construction is now at its lowest in seven or eight years with only two active projects and he is trying to get the BC-4 bid out in the next week. He noted that we hope to award this project before the March meeting.

Mr. Weaver noted that he would like to discuss the Blue Mountain Real Estate Letter. He noted that GHD is in charge of reviewing the plans and there is a dispute between Mr. DiSanto and Mr. Mahoney, noting that they have not come to an agreement in terms of how they are sewerage their properties together.

Mr. Weaver noted that Mr. Mahoney showed the sewer easement off one foot of the property line so Mr. DiSanto could not tie into it. He explained that we required that the drawings be revised to accomplish that, so this letter states that they will consider doing that but they want some information from the Authority first.

Mr. Weaver noted that we keep going around in circles, but basically we can't provide the information they are requesting because the agenda item tonight was tabled as they want the calculation that we used for Donco and we can't release that until the Resolution is actually approved. He noted that they are playing games.

Mr. Shannon noted that there is a memo from Mr. Wendle and himself recommending that the Authority charge full value for in-house observers. He noted that it had come to GHD's attention that the Authority was charging \$20 an hour. Mr. Seeds noted when you look at rates and have to consider going with the contractor or the Authority, the price difference is \$20 to \$57. Mr. Shannon noted if he was a developer he would go with the Township guy for \$20. Mr. Seeds noted that is not the true price. Mr. Wendle noted that it did not seem right that the other rate payers were subsidizing the developer's inspection costs. He noted that they complained because the Authority doesn't have enough inspectors, having to use some GHD inspectors and

they don't want to pay the rate. Mr. Wendle noted that the rate is what it is and it seems that at a minimum the Authority should be charging the true burden rate which is around \$40 to \$55.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there is a legal issue. Mr. Stine stated that he did not know if the Authority can charge review or inspection fees for employees. He noted that you can pay a third party consultant as they are being reimbursed for the Authority for its costs, as it is out-of-pocket expenses, typically employees are not considered out of pocket expenses, they are on a fixed salary so if you charge them for their applicable hourly rate, essentially the employee costs that Authority nothing by the end of the year or very little. He noted that normally, at least, from the Township perspective, when they have review fees and inspection fees they are for third parties, not for Township employees.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the answer is to contract everything and let GHD do all the inspection. Mr. Stine noted that is a possibility. Mr. Wolfe noted that there is no good answer for how to get around this. He noted if there was one we would not have this situation. Mr. Weaver noted that we will have to make a recommendation for this at some point.

Mr. Seeds noted in the Annual Report, Section 4.2 Blue Ridge, there has been no response from PennDOT in regards to billing them for raising the manhole. Ms. Smith answered that Blue Ridge was different from the other projects in that normally we get drawings from PennDOT as they have a set project that they are doing. She noted for Blue Ridge Avenue, they just went ahead and paved it and paved over the manholes. She noted that Mr. Wetzel and Mr. Hilson found out later that they had done this and that the manholes were buried and they raised the manhole so that they could have access to them. She noted that it was PennDOT's maintenance department that did the paving, and they stated that they would pay for half of the costs, so she got the information from the Township for what the costs were and the inspection rates to do that. She noted that she contacted PennDOT as we normally have an agreement and all the paperwork that goes with it to base off what we would charge them, but since there was no agreement for it and they just went through and paved the road, she did not have the numbers to deal with to determine what the reimbursement would be. She noted that she has been corresponding with PennDOT to see what she needs to do and they haven't gotten back to her yet.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there has been an update for Linglestown Road. He noted that there are more problems at that location than just raising the manholes. Mr. Hilson noted that there is nothing new for that project. He noted that the frames and covers were offset. Mr.

Shannon noted that we were prepared to do adjustments on the manholes by the Linglestown Road pump station but then a more severe issue was found. He stated that we shut it down for winter until we figure out what to do with it. He noted that there is nothing more to report on it.

Ms. Lindsey noted that it was her understanding that some of the manhole was not paved around and some of the plows were damaged. Mr. Hilson answered that they were paved around but sometimes when you plow the paving it comes up and it also tends to move down. Mr. Wolfe noted that we broke a couple of blades. Mr. Weaver noted that is not accurate. He investigated the complaint and there was only one manhole that the paving busted up and it happens. He noted that the Sewer Department did not do anything wrong. He noted that all the manholes have paving around them. Mr. Hilson noted that we are looking to get some hot mix, although we could cold patch but the snow plow will just push the cold patch to the side of the road. He noted that we are waiting for York Building Products to open their hot mix plant, noting that it will open after this cold snap, probably next week. He noted that we will get a load and pave them again in case we get more snow. Mr. Weaver noted that there is a significant issue here that needs to be addressed and we should have a meeting with Public Works as there is always two ways of looking at something. He noted that Public Works gets upset because they hit a manhole and broke a plow. He noted that is a dangerous situation. He suggested that they should be prepared for that.

Mr. Eby questioned if there are some kind of markings to alert the Public Works Department. Mr. Wolfe noted the ones we are talking about are in the middle of the street and you can't prepare for that. Mr. Eby noted that where you have a guiderail... Mr. Weaver noted that you should be aware that there is a manhole there and you should take precautions for it and you don't drive 30 mph. Mr. Seeds noted that there are other issues involved with it as well. He noted if they have rollers under them where they have the blade; there are a lot of issues involved.

Mr. Weaver suggested that the simple solution that he would recommend is that his staff should plow those areas. Mr. Hilson noted that he doesn't like it either as most of the time it breaks the frame so there is damage to the manhole. Mr. Wolfe noted that it has been a very hard winter, we had a lot of construction, and some of it did not get put to bed. Mr. Hilson noted that we had a paving subcontractor who over committed and then didn't deliver, so that was another issue.

Mr. Eby noted if you have a four foot marker on the side, having a briefing with all your Public Works personnel, noting that these are the areas to watch. He noted that you may not have the same plow driver on the same road. Mr. Seeds noted that they pretty much do have the same plow driver so they get familiar with him. Mr. Eby noted that sometimes you will have different elevations no matter what. He noted that it is going to happen, but having some kind of marking system on the side would help.

Mr. Weaver noted that the priority for the sewer contractor is not worrying about plowing streets, they are worried about all these other problems that are out there and the Board is well educated on that, utility, water line breaks, homeowners running out of the house and the last thing that they are worried about is the Public Works Department coming in and plowing snow. He noted that we need to meet with Public Works to say this stuff will occur and if there is a manhole that is not set exactly set perfect and a snow storm is coming we need to look out for these manholes. He noted in this case there was one that was off and the paving was compacted correctly and when the plow hit the paving that was in front of the manhole, the whole chunk of paving just popped off and then the plow hit the manhole frame and basically took a whole chunk of it out, and now there is a chunk missing from the manhole frame. Mr. Weaver noted that one manhole out of 75 manholes is still good. Mr. Hilson noted in the beginning of the season, when we were pushing the contractor to get all the manholes winterizes, we did make one of the contractors plow the streets since he did not get it done, due to the possible damages.

Mr. Seeds requested Mr. Eby to discuss with the Authority his friend Keith Hite who is coming in to speak to the Authority so everyone is on board with what is going on.

Mr. Eby noted since we are having a strategic meeting in March and he is working on a project in Lancaster that is looking at alternative funding. He noted that you have the bonds that have bond fees, the interest rates, but his would be a new concept. He noted that typically you are looking at parking garages but any kind of public utility such a sewer or water is an asset. He noted that it would be a lease-lease back. He noted that he only has limited information on how it works and that is why he wanted to see if it would be worthwhile to have someone come in and make a presentation during the strategic meeting.

Mr. Eby noted with the lease/lease back you have seen some bad deals where a municipality, such a big cities, sell their parking system and get a big chunk of money up front but then they don't have any control such as the City of Chicago where they sign a bad deal and now they have no control over the parking rates and they can't build new. He noted that the

lease/lease back is a little different, part of what you own or the entire thing is leased to them and they provide a big chunk of money that the Authority could invest anywhere, a 25-year term and considered operating costs, so there are no fees and you could use the funds to pay down the debt. He noted that it does not show up as debt, rather operating costs so it is something to look at and they will not have anything to do with the operations, they lease it back to the Authority and the Authority has full control for the rates, projects and maintenance. He suggested that it is something worth looking to see if it can eliminate the rising operating costs. He noted that he has been dealing with one person at the firm and another person, Keith Hite who Mr. Hawk knows. He explained that he hopes to meet with him and Mr. Hawk in the next two weeks to get more information.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Eby contacted him and he reached out to Keith Hite who knew about the program and he asked him if he would make himself available for what he knows and we thought that we should take a look at it. Mr. Eby noted that they are looking at all 3<sup>rd</sup> Class Cities in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Seeds questioned if anyone has any knowledge of this. Mr. Eby noted that most of what we are familiar with are leases where that company operates it as they are looking at the financial gains for the investments. Mr. Weaver answered that he never heard of this at any of the conferences that he has been to. Mr. Wendle answered that he has not either, as the only lease back that he is aware of is when you have a financing authority that leases it back to the local municipality like the City of Harrisburg used to be. Mr. Hawk noted that is what he thought that it would be. He suggested that the Sewer Authority could meet with Mr. Hite as he would be willing to share what he knows and if it doesn't work, then it doesn't work.

Mr. Seeds questioned if he will charge us to meet with us. Mr. Eby answered no as the gentleman that he knows is the Executive Director, and they have a new firm and have had financial backing for a long time, but he has developed a new firm, brought in Senator Brubaker and a few other individuals that are knowledgeable in development. He suggested that it is worth looking at to find out the terms and the benefits.

Mr. Hawk noted that Ms. Lindsey is available on Monday morning as she does not work... Mr. Eby questioned what the sunshine regulations are for how many people can meet. Mr. Hawk noted if we meet at 7:30 in the morning it works for Mr. Eby as he has to get to Lancaster.

Mr. Seeds questioned if all the Board has an interest, and if so, we should see if there is time in March so we can all met together. Mr. Hawk noted that he had three dates from Mr. Hite, Monday the 10<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> or 12<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Eby explained that they seem to want to meet to get a feeling if we want to have a public meeting on it or even if it is worth bringing them in.

Mr. Hawk noted if there is no interest that is fine, he understands that. Mr. Seeds noted that is why he spoke with Mr. Eby to make sure the Board is aware of what we are looking at to see if there is any interest at all. He questioned if it should be done with the Board or only have two or three people meet with this person.

Mr. Blain noted that he would like to know more about this noting that a lot of what he is reading for lease/lease backs can be pretty common with school districts but he has never heard it being used in a municipal authority type setting so he would like to know more about it.

Mr. Wolfe suggested with the number of Board members who are interested in it, they should just come to the meeting on March 24<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Eby suggested that to them as well. Mr. Seeds noted that everyone would like to hear the presentation and he questioned if we would have time during that meeting. Mr. Wolfe noted that we can make time.

Mr. Weaver noted that the only thing on the agenda for the March meeting is the tapping fee resolution and the strategic plan. Mr. Seeds requested Mr. Eby or Mr. Hawk to make contact and see if they can come March 24<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Eby explained that he suggested that to them. Mr. Seeds requested Mr. Eby to follow up on that and let Mr. Weaver know if they can attend.

Mr. Hawk noted that he knows Mr. Hite well enough that he can call him.

Mr. Seeds noted that the meeting will be at GHD at the same time in March. Mr. Eby questioned if we could move the start time to 6:30 p.m. as he has a work commitment. Mr. Wolfe noted that he never intended for the March meeting to be held at GHD, he noted that the March meeting will be held at the Municipal Center.

Mr. Seeds noted that we will not be serving food as the general rule is we only serve food for meetings that start before 6 p.m. He noted that we could put the presenter on the schedule first.

### **Solicitor's Report**

Mr. Stine noted that he had no report.

## **Adjournment**

Mr. Seeds made a motion to adjourn the meeting, and the meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle  
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

William L. Hornung  
Authority Secretary