

**PETERS TOWNSHIP
SANITARY AUTHORITY**

3244 WASHINGTON ROAD
McMURRAY, PA 15317-3153
PHONE: 724-941-6709
FAX: 724-941-2283
Web Site: ptsaonline.org



James J. Miskis, Manager
Mark A. Chucuddy, Asst. Manager
Patricia L. Foote, Financial Controller
Cindy L. Coe-Verschage, Admin. Asst.

REGULAR MEETING

April 11, 2006

ROLL CALL:

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Peters Township Sanitary Authority was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by the Chairman. Board members present were G. Robert Jacobs, Denver E. Yingling, John P. Slagle, Gerald C. Grubesky and George A. Khalouf. Also present were Craig Bauer, KLH Engineers, Inc.; Fred E. Baxter, Jr., Solicitor; James J. Miskis, Manager; Mark A. Chucuddy, Assistant Manager; Patricia L. Foote, Financial Controller; and Cindy L. Coe-Verschage, Administrative Assistant.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A Motion was made by Mr. Slagle and seconded by Mr. Yingling to approve the minutes of the March 14, 2006 meeting as prepared by Ms. Coe-Verschage, with minor corrections. The motion carried unanimously.

VISITORS:

1. Allen J. Uhrine Address: 112 Fireside Drive
Re: Observation of Meeting

Mr. Uhrine taped recorded the meeting.

2. Peters Township Residents:

Jeff & Diane Lang	964 Churchill Rd.
Dave & Robina Harris	970 Churchill Rd.
Lowry & Rebecca Stoops	973 Churchill Rd.

Bethel Park Residents:

Beverly Misgalla	6449 Churchill Rd
Yvonne Rigatti	6457 Churchill Rd
Catherine Miles	6469 Churchill Rd
John Heavill	6469 Churchill Rd
Chris Patten	6471 Churchill Rd
Devon Cole	6471 Churchill Rd

Re: Piney Fork Watershed of Peters Township Act 537 Sewage Planning

Mr. Jacobs asked if all visitors were attending for the same subject. All indicated they were with the exception of Mr. Uhrine. Mr. Jacobs requested one visitor to identify their concerns in two or three sentences. One visitor expressed that they had heard the Authority purchased residential property in their neighborhood for the purpose of building a sewage treatment plant and they were concerned regarding their property values. A second visitor mentioned concerns regarding the impact of development on the watershed.

Mr. Bauer of KLH Engineers, outlined the process of comprehensive sewage facilities planning, commonly referred to as Act 537 Sewage Planning. The Authority contracted KLH Engineers to prepare a planning study to identify and evaluate alternatives for sewage disposal in the area of Peters Township which is part of the Piney Fork Watershed. Currently this area is served by on-lot sewage disposal, with a couple of homes within Peters Township directly connected to the Bethel Park public sewerage system. When the planning study is complete it will be submitted to the Authority Board for approval, and then submitted to Township Council. If Township Council approves the planning study, it would then be submitted to the Pa. Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). As of this time no public body has approved the planning study.

The plan would consider five alternatives. They consisted of 1) the no action alternative; 2) connection to the Bethel Park public sewer system for treatment at the existing Piney Fork Treatment Plant; 3) construct a pumping station for discharge to the Peters Creek Sanitary Authority Sewer System; 4) construct a package treatment plant; and 5) construct a pumping station for discharge to the Authority's Brush Run Sewer System.

Alternative 1) No Action, is generally not acceptable as a long term solution where higher density housing is likely to occur because it would rely on continued use of on-lot disposal methods in an area where the soils are considered only marginally acceptable for such disposal practice, therefore it is eliminated from consideration. Alternative 2) Connect to Bethel Park Sewer System, is deemed the overall best and most favorable solution, however Bethel Park Municipal Authority has formally indicated that their treatment system does not have the capacity and they are not willing to consider offering service at this time. Alternative 3) Pump Station to Peters Creek Sanitary Authority Sewer System is eliminated because they do not accept sewage flows from outside the Peters Creek Watershed. Alternative 4) Construct a Package Treatment Plant, and Alternative 5) Pump to Brush Run Sewer System, remain viable alternatives.

However, with the intended development of the Piney Fork Watershed, coupled with Bethel Park's recent formal response declining to accept the sewage flows from this area of Peters Township due to its sewerage system being hydraulically overloaded, there remains only two viable alternatives, pump to Brush Run, or construct a package treatment plant. Mr. Bauer later pointed out that DEP has indicated that any treatment plant constructed would be a temporary facility, with ultimate connection to the Bethel Park sewer system when capacity is available in the future.

A visitor questioned if the Brush Run sewer system had capacity to receive the sewage flows. Mr. Bauer indicated the treatment plant has the capacity but there are portions of the sewer system which have hydraulic limitations to receiving sewage flows from a pumping station.

Questions followed regarding the zoning of the property acquired by the Authority at 972 and 974 Churchill Road, and how a non-residential use of the property could be considered. Mr. Baxter indicated there are essential services exceptions to zoning, and sewage collection and disposal is an essential service. Permission would have to be obtained from the Zoning Hearing Board.

Mr. Jacobs pointed out the Authority does not want a package treatment plant, but the other feasible alternative, a pumping station to Brush Run, also has negative aspects that must be considered in the planning process.

A visitor indicated that a portion of Trax Farms recently sold, and there was speculation of a large development occurring. The Authority was not aware of the reported property transaction.

Questions followed as to what kind of treatment facility is being considered, and what would be expected with a pump station. Mr. Bauer reported the capacity of the facility would be approximately 50,000 gallons/day, and would consist of several small rectangular tanks, each approximately the area of the conference room table. There would need to be a building to house blowers and other equipment. One option is enclosing the entire treatment facility in a building which would be equipped with odor control. Whereas, with a pumping station almost everything would be below grade, with only a control panel above grade. Whichever facility is selected, it would be equipped with security fencing and appropriate landscaping.

Questions followed regarding the costs of each facility. Mr. Bauer reported the pumping station alternative is substantially more expensive due to the extensive distance of the force main, and the requirement to extend from the existing gravity sewers to the divide between the Brush Run and Piney Fork Watersheds.

Questions followed regarding the size of the development. Mr. Miskis clarified that since we are not aware of any development plans at this time we can only answer from the perspective of the watershed area considered in the planning study. This area is approximately 166 acres which would yield approximately 150 homes. One visitor commented they had heard the development consisted of 200 to 300 homes. Mr. Miskis indicated that is not possible, at least not in the planning study area.

Questions followed regarding what the residents could do to prevent a treatment facility. Mr. Miskis asked for a show of hands for those residents from Bethel Park, and suggested they persuade Bethel Park to reverse its position regarding accepting the sewage flows from Peters Township, since that is the best alternative for all parties. Several visitors commented that was unlikely due to problems in the Bethel Park sewer system which has been on-going for decades.

Questions were asked 1) When would the planning study be completed? 2) How can the residents be kept informed of the progress and be alerted to the public meetings regarding the plan approval? and 3) What is the formal name of the study? Mr. Bauer indicated the study is expected to be completed sometime this year. The visitors were directed to the Authority's website, which contains the Board meeting minutes. The 30-day public comment period on the 537 Plan would be advertised in the Observer Reporter. While a public hearing on the plan is not a requirement of the 537 Planning process the Authority would recommend that such be held. There would also be the Zoning Hearing Board essential services exception request hearing. Mr. Miskis identified the name of the planning study as "Piney Fork Watershed of Peters Township Act 537 Plan".

Questions were asked regarding areas of the land which drain away from the property acquired by the Authority. Mr. Bauer indicated the planning study is addressing the area of the Piney Fork Watershed in Peters Township. If the inquiry is regarding other areas adjacent to the study area, those areas most likely drain to Peters Creek, and would therefore be in the Peters Creek Sanitary Authority's service area, and would be serviced by them.

Questions were asked as to whom actually decides what alternative is implemented. Mr. Khalouf indicated ultimately it's DEP's decision. Mr. Miskis added that it is more of a joint effort between the Authority, the Township, and DEP. The Authority will make a recommendation to the Township which may accept or revise the recommendation, and when forwarded to DEP, DEP may request revisions to the proposed plan.

A question was asked if the cost of the selected alternative is at the entire cost of the developer, why would the cost of the selected alternative be criteria for deciding which alternative to select? Mr. Bauer explained the developer is only required to construct the capacity for his development. Ultimately, the selected alternative will serve the entire watershed area, which includes a number of existing dwellings and other properties. The cost for the capacity to serve these properties would be the Authority's cost. The intent of Act 537 sewage planning process is to have a comprehensive sewage plan whereby all of the sewage needs of the study area are addressed in an efficient manner.

Mr. Grubesky indicated that much of what is being discussed this evening is conjecture until the study is completed and a firm recommendation is made. While many of the visitors seem to think it's a matter of costs outweighing the aesthetics, it is not that black and white. Things change and develop as the subject is explored and advanced. Once the study is further along more definitive data can be provided. As far as influencing us, your presence here this evening has already done that.

Mr. Jacobs concluded the discussion on the subject of the Piney Fork area 537 Planning Study. All visitors regarding this subject departed at that time.

SOLICITOR'S REPORT: Copy on file

ENGINEER'S REPORT: Copy on file

Mr. Bauer reported that KLH Engineers is reviewing the As-Builts submitted by the developer for Hidden Brook Plan. Upon initial review, there are a couple of sewer sections with slopes below acceptable minimum. KLH will continue the review and outline the necessary corrective measures.

Overlook Plan, Maple Lane Pump Station design is about 35% complete. The site requirements are complete.

DC WWTP Act 537 Comprehensive Sewage Planning is ongoing. A meeting is scheduled with the Authority staff for April 21, 2006.

KLH Engineers is in the process of preparing documents for the DEP required Laboratory Accreditation.

Mr. Glen Johnston, contractor for the Ivy Lane Project, responded verbally to KLH Engineers' notice regarding the Hutton driveway issue. Mr. Bauer has requested his response to be in writing.

KLH Engineers submitted an analysis for management's review of the Crossgates sewer replacement and hydraulic issue.

MANAGER'S REPORT: Copy on file

Mr. Miskis discussed the re-bidding of the sludge disposal contract. The current five-year contract expires this October. Mr. Bauer submitted a proposal to prepare the necessary documents in the lump sum of \$3,900. The Authority had budgeted \$2,500 for this task. Mr. Miskis recommended acceptance of the proposal.

A Motion was made by Mr. Slagle and seconded by Mr. Khalouf to approve KLH Engineers' Proposal for Dewatered Biosolids Hauling and Disposal Contract / Bid Specifications and Bid Phase Services in the amount of \$3,900. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Miskis discussed the Crestview Acres Sewer Replacement project. There is an alternative alignment which would involve obtaining an easement from one property owner, but would eliminate substantial footage through back yards, thereby reducing costs. Management recommends offering compensation to obtain the easement for the disturbance of the boundary layer. The Board agreed that compensation is not to exceed \$3,500.

There was discussion concerning sewer mains on Marble Drive that were installed before the formation of the Authority. Many of the homes across the street from the sewer main are connected into common laterals. Management has asked for Board census, Board agreed, on the following approach; that we take over the ownership of these laterals serving multiple properties and take the necessary steps to provide for proper maintenance, such as installed manholes and cleanouts.

Mr. Miskis discussed stream bank erosion problems in the valley between Old Washington Rd. and Route 19. The Authority staff will address the exposed pipe and KLH Engineers will assist with obtaining the required stream permit.

There was a discussion regarding the dispute between the Township and the Pa Builder's Association in reference to the adopted ordinance amending the Township Building code that requires more stringent building sewer standards than the Uniform Construction Code. In order to settle the dispute, the Pa Builder's is requesting all sewer inspectors be certified under the UCC. The Township has requested the Authority's input on the matter. Management recommends that we agree to the certification. This would not take effect until 2007; the Authority is currently grandfathered under old regulations until 2007. The Board was in general agreement.

There was a discussion regarding the mandatory deduct meter inspection program that was initiated in the fall of 2005. Management recommends the property owner be given a one-time penalty waiver for a broken seal, for the initial inspection only, provided there are no other violations. In order to gain confidence that future violations will not be a problem, all customers identified with broken seals during their initial inspection would be placed on a list for random meter inspections. Any found broken or missing would lose their credit for the season. The Authority will conduct a minimum number of yearly random inspections for this purpose based on the number of broken seal violations. Any customer not agreeing to the inspection would lose their credit. There would not be an additional inspection charge for this random inspection.

A Motion was made by Mr. Khalouf and seconded by Mr. Yingling to grant a one-time waiver of penalty for deduct and remote meter broken seals for all customers throughout the first inspection process, provided no other problem occurs jointly with the broken seals that indicates tampering. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Miskis discussed the Maple Lane Pump Station/Overlook Development. The developer desires to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding, which outlines responsibilities of the Authority and the Developer and includes the cost sharing arrangement. Management recommends the approval of the Memorandum of Understanding.

A Motion was made by Mr. Khalouf and seconded by Mr. Slagle to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding on the Overlook Plan. The motion carried unanimously.

CORRESPONDENCE FOR THE BOARD’S INFORMATION: Copy on file

FINANCIAL CONTROLLER’S REPORT: Copy on file

FINANCIAL STATEMENT REVIEW: Month ending February 28, 2006.

PAYMENT OF BILLS & REQUISITIONS: Copy on File

A Motion was made by Mr. Slagle and seconded by Mr. Khalouf to approve Disbursements in amount of \$88,449.56 from to following funds: The motion carried unanimously.

<u>Fund</u>	<u>Disbursement</u>	<u>Total</u>
Operating	Checks: 13668 – 13733	\$66,676.62
Developer	Transfer to Operating	\$ 666.33
CIRF	Transfer to Operating & Req. 31-06	\$23,746.61

OTHER BUSINESS:

Mr. Miskis outlined the agreement with the SHACOG (South Hills Area Council of Governments) for joint dye testing. The Authority has to execute the agreement in order to be recognized as part of the process.

A Motion was made by Mr. Slagle and seconded by Mr. Yingling to enter into the SHACOG joint dye testing program. The motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT:

A Motion was made by Mr. Khalouf seconded by Mr. Yingling to adjourn the meeting at 9:13 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cindy L. Coe-Verschage