

**BETHEL TOWNSHIP MUNICIPAL AUTHORITY
MINUTES**

April 23, 2009

A special meeting of the Bethel Township Municipal Authority was called to order by Chairman, David Younker at 7:05 p.m. on April 23, 2009 at the Township Office, Frystown, PA.

Roll Call

Chairman Younker called the roll:

Rufus Geesaman – present

Harold Gruber – present

Kevin Stupp –present

David Younker – present

Carl Weaver – present

Also present were John Roche, Vision Engineering and Darlene Orendo, Secretary.

Public Comment on Agenda

None

Member Report

Rufus Geesaman received an application from PMAA to renew our membership dues at a cost of \$150.00. A motion was made by Carl Weaver to renew the membership for \$150.00. Second by Harold Gruber. All agreed. Motion carried.

Rufus also reported on the visit he had to North Lebanon Township Municipal Authority. They were coating one of their man holes with the same spray on material Abel Recon presented to members at our last meeting.

Solicitor Report

Solicitor Parish was absent from the meeting. Items will be discussed under the Engineer's report.

Engineer's Report

1. Frystown WWTP Site (Contract # 5) Groundwater remediation alternatives.
 - a. Removal of Groundwater with Wells and discharge (no changes to current layout).
 - i. This option was the original proposal as presented by the project Geologist. It is projected that the additional studies and permitting of this proposal will be an additional (approximate) \$100,000.
 - ii. After the design/permitting and layout the construction costs (installation of the wells) could approach another approximate \$100,000.
 - iii. This option would have a series of (at least 6 but maybe more) wells around the site in order to draw down the groundwater levels

to below the proposed structure elevation. The water from these wells would then be discharged onto the ground and would flow into the nearby stream.

- iv. This option would require a permit to remove and discharge the groundwater and would be subject to continued monitoring (testing) and maintenance.
- v. This alternative was recently discussed with the Geotechnical Engineer who has made the following general recommendations:
 - 1. This alternative is not the most economical solution due to the ongoing costs (operational and maintenance).
 - 2. The geotechnical engineer is NOT concerned with removing the groundwater to establish a viable foundation (sub-grade).
- b. Keep groundwater as is but construct a heavier structure (prevent flotation and infiltration) & watertight building to the current elevations (building/pumps).
 - i. The structural Engineer in lieu of the first option has redesigned the structure in order that the structure will not float (due to the groundwater) but will also be a watertight structure. These revisions will allow for the groundwater to stay where it is and not affect the overall structure or pumps.
 - ii. Marks' Contracting has submitted a cost estimate to construct this revised structure which is estimated at an additional \$ 213,000.
- c. Raise the basement floor for the suction lift pumps at the sacrifice of pumping capacity (or add a third suction line for future 3rd pump- by developers).
 - i. The pump manufacturer has just verified that this is a possibility this past Friday evening. Therefore we have not been able to get revised designs and costs for the Authority's consideration. However, we would be comfortable telling the Authority that the cost will be at an additional cost but should NOT approach the cost of the above scenario (5 feet shallower structure). If the Authority would like to develop these costs we can have this done.
 - ii. One benefit of this scenario would allow the installation of only 2 pumps at this time but when the third pump is required most likely the costs will be borne by developers.
- d. Eliminate the basement and replace the suction lift pumps with submersible pumps.
 - i. The pump supplier has not fully developed this option (price) but has indicated that this can certainly be done for less upfront cost than the above proposals. However, the long term costs (of having submersible pumps vs. suction lift pumps) have not been considered. (This goes back to the life cycle cost analysis the Authority had completed when they decided to use the Suction lift pumps).

2. Lining Work for Manholes and Logistics
 - a. This office attended (as a courtesy) a field spraying of manholes in North Lebanon Township this week to witness the spray shield application process (Abel Recon) with Rufus – see attached photos.
 - b. Reference attached email (Terry Parish) regarding the processing of this work if the Board is further interested.
 - i. If the Board is interested in this upgrade, this office would recommend targeting specific structures such as the influent wet well structures, wet wells for the pump stations, drop manholes and any other appropriate structures.
 - ii. This office (as directed) can prepare bid documents as necessary.
 - iii. This office can also review the available funding sources.
3. Other Improvement and Funding considerations:
 - a. With the recent submission and subsequent review of the BCIDA sewer plans it has been made clear that the Klahr road sewer area will no longer be serviced by the improvements on this site (BCIDA).
 - b. The Board may want to authorize investigating further options in servicing this area since the current Township's 537 plan shows this area to be serviced by Sewers. Furthermore, this issue may be brought to light during the planning module process (Township Building expansion).
 - c. The current funding climate (stimulus packages) is favorable if the Board would want to explore other options of providing sewer to this area at this time.
4. Plant Operations logistics (contract operations versus Township employee). We have provided (electronically) the Board members with a few general work descriptions and can specifically tailor these to the BTMA sites upon further direction in this regard.

The following notes were taken during the Engineer's report from discussion with the Board and Vision Engineering:

1. Frystown WWTP (Contract #5)

1. Members were given 4 different options to consider for groundwater remediation. After discussion Rufus Geesaman made a motion to go with option 2. Kevin Stupp seconded the motion. All agreed. Motion carried.

2. Lining work for manholes was then discussed. Vision will check into funding and compile some bid specs for the Board.

3. John will check with Vickie Johnson regarding available funding to service this area. This may be tacked onto the current project or consider as a separate one.

Unfinished Business

Permanent Line Easement Agreement - Rufus Geesaman made a motion to have the chairman and secretary sign the agreement to settle the litigations with Wesley

Weiant for \$1250.00 and \$750.00 for attorney fees. Second by Carl Weaver. All agreed. Motion carried.

Bethel Driveway – John advised members Andrew Zeiset has received an HOP permit from PENN DOT. John had a plan for them to review. He will discuss the legalities with Solicitor Parish.

New Business

Rufus reported that the Verizon phone lines will be installed this week , there will be 2 lines to the plant and 1 to the pump station. We also received the phone numbers. No DSL will be available at this time.

Paving at Frystown was discussed. John will suggest Jao Bradley contact Supervisor Randall Haag regarding this issue.

Adjournment

A motion to adjourn the meeting at 8: 32 p.m. was made by Rufus Geesaman. Second by Kevin Stupp.

Respectfully Submitted,

Darlene M. Orendo
Secretary