

1. **CALL TO ORDER:** 3:00 p.m.
2. **NOTIFICATION:** All public sessions of the South Whitehall Township Board of Authority are electronically recorded. The electronic record is kept until the minutes of the meeting are approved and destroyed if a request is not made to retain the electronic version at that time.

ATTENDANCE: Daniel G. D’Imperio, Chairman
William Geiger, Vice Chairman
Richard O. Klotz, Treasurer
Vacancy, BOA Secretary
Craig J. Walls, Assist. Secretary-Treasurer
Howard L. Kutzler, Director of Admin./
Acting Township Manager
Bob Ibach, PW Manager
Jerry Charvala, PW Utilities Group Leader - Absent
Blake C. Marles, Solicitor
Lenore M. Horos, Finance Manager
Brooke Apple, Accounting Supervisor
Tracy J. Fehnel, Executive Assistant

3. **MINUTES:** August 18, 2014 Minutes (page 5)

A motion was made by Craig Walls, and seconded by Bill Geiger, to approve the August 18, 2014, BOA Minutes. All in favor; none opposed.

4. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- a. **Appeal Hearings - Status:**

- 1) **Rothrock Motors, David Rothrock – Rt 22 and 15th Street, Allentown, regarding Tapping Fee Challenge – Extension September 15, 2014 (page 15)**
Rothrock was given an extension until the next BOA Meeting, October 20, 2014.
- 2) **Josh Early Candies – 4640 Tilghman Street, Allentown, regarding Excessive Strength Discharges: Correspondence from William G. Malkames, Esquire (page 17)**

Attorney Bill Malkames, from Allentown, PA, was present as the Attorney for Josh Early Candies. Barry Dobil, President, of Josh Early Candies (JEC) was also in attendance. They were here in response to the statements they received concerning the grease trap situation.

Solicitor Marles wanted to first go over the prerequisites, which are in the review process to an appeal.

Solicitor Marles said that Resolution 2014-1-BOA establishes the review/hearing process under which JEC is here today. This resolution states prerequisites for an appeal.

He went on to say that the appeal needs to be received by the BOA within 60 days of the date set forth in correspondence which communicated the fee or charge. What was the date of the correspondence and date of the appeal?

Howard Kutzler said Invoice #1830 was dated December 16, 2013; Amount due was \$7,007.83, which was due January 15, 2014. Payment made May 1, 2014.

Attorney Malkames said it was paid under protest. The amount in contest is \$7,007.83.

Solicitor Marles continued with the appeal process. The appeal process requires that (1) The customer filing the challenge is the property owner. Is that the case?

Attorney Malkames said Yes.

Solicitor Marles - (2) The written notice of the appeal must state the basis for the challenge, and must have appended to it (or delivered with it) data in support thereof, to provide a reasonable opportunity for resolution of the dispute without the necessity of a hearing. Does this exist/did it occur?

Attorney Malkames said that he knows a letter was sent. A letter was sent on July 8, 2014. There was one sent prior to that.

Solicitor Marles said that he has a letter dated April 3, 2014, from Barry Dobil. Please note we are continuing to work on a resolution... etc. So the basis for the challenge, I presume, based upon this letter, would be that the testing was done incorrectly.

Attorney Malkames said that is a portion of it. The letter of July 9, 2014, to Mr. Kutzler, addressed some other issues.

Solicitor Marles said there is a July 9, 2013, letter asking for additional information. That was not an indication for the basis of the challenge.

Attorney Malkames said that it also talked about, paragraph d, the letter sent on behalf of the Authority states in part, said it should start November 30, 2012. JEC was billed for a period before that date.

Solicitor Marles pointed out that the bill appears to be 2013. The billing is for a year later. The Authority didn't begin this process until the first year after the resolution was put in

place. Your letter suggests that JEC should only have been charged for excess use generated after November 30, 2012. It says the Authority billing started April 1, 2012.

Attorney Marles said Yes.

Barry Dobil, JEC, said, here is the original charge. The time frame is from 7/1/2012 to 10/1/2013. That is what the consumption on which the billing is based.

Solicitor Marles said then the question is, was the billing actually from 7/2012, or was it a typo?

Barry Dobil, JEC, said that he believes the period billed for is April 1, 2012 to October 1, 2013.

At this point of the hearing, Solicitor Marles said that all the preliminary items have been taken care of. He gave Mr. Dobil the opportunity to make his case. Additionally, Solicitor Marles took this time to list all exhibits involved in this matter. Exhibits A-L, which will be reflected in the "Decision" which will be written up by Solicitor Marles.

Some discussion took place with regard to the bill—there was some confusion with regard to the time period JEC was billed for. Treasurer Klotz said that if the bill was wrong, we will correct the bill.

Attorney Malkames felt that the heart of the matter, and what is a concern to Mr. Dobil, is that everyone in SWT contributes to the extra strength problem and what goes into the system, yet, we are only charging individuals who have food stores and similar stores, which is unfair, but essentially the BOA cannot help us with. However, Mr. Dobil feels he should only be billed for the effluent that goes through the grease trap, which would only relate to the water used for the processing of the food. He feels the 209,000 gallons of water used at JEC, for which they are being billed for and subject to excessive effluent charges, he feels this is an erroneous number. Much of the water that is used, is not subject to the contamination of fats, oils, and grease. Only a portion of the 209,000 gallons of water used is subject to excessive effluent charges. JEC is therefore looking for relief to lower the amount of water subject to these charges. The amount of water used in the manufacturing process is definitely no more than 50%; Mr. Dobil felt the amount used in the factory is closer to 25%. He said to keep in mind too, that much of the water used is evaporated in the process.

Another point Barry Dobil brought up is that the SWTA is also being subject to test results, which come from tests not being done correctly by those doing the testing. He pointed out that there is correspondence from Benchmark which indicates that the first test was not done appropriately.

He went on to say that there have been a number of things which contributed to the delay in coming to the BOA and trying to rectify this. Also, the original bill was based on the most

egregious testing done. Additionally, all subsequent testing was submitted to the BOA for their information.

The test information was reviewed/discussed by the BOA at this time. The earliest test done, after the error test, was done on March 7, 2014. Mr. Dobil explained that based upon his conversation with Benchmark, wrong dissolution rates are being applied to the samples, which prevents from coming up with an absolute number and which adversely affects the results of tests taken.

The BOA was concerned and confused because in some of the retests, the numbers climbed even higher. Mr. Dobil said that he was also confused by this. He said that he does not want to be paying over \$7,000 every six months, and as a businessman, he simply cannot afford this. He said that if it means putting a grease trap under every single sink to resolve the problem, he would. \$7,000 would go a long way to paying for these grease traps. He is not opposed to initially spending whatever it takes to remedy this problem. He is just concerned by all the variables that seem to exist with this problem, and with numbers which fluctuate greatly. He is also looking for an explanation.

At this point, discussion pursued with regard to where and how the tests are taken, and other things which may drive up the levels of the extra strength discharged into the system. Mr. Dobil said that he would welcome BOA inputs as to how to bring down his levels. He is not trying to sidestep the issue. He just wants to have some kind of resolution to the problem of the high levels—he wants to fix the problem.

Solicitor Marles explained how the Authority got to this point. He explained that the Agreements the Authority has with the City of Allentown requires the Authority to bill excessive strength users. There was not a mechanism for doing that, so the Authority attempted to put together a mechanism to do that. And, rather than having the Authority come out to do the testing, what the Authority decided to do at the time was say to the users, we will give you the names of a couple of labs that are reputable in the area, but you pick the lab, you decide where/when it is sampled, and we will bill you based on the results that you give us. So, this is what happened. It wasn't the Township mandating Benchmark or anyone else. There were a couple of possibilities. The board has no desire that you have high charges. We had to put the process in place because Allentown mandated it. Anything you can do to reduce your total cost makes everybody happy. Based upon data that JEC supplied, it's hard for the BOA to say we will reduce a bill, unless you can provide data that is more accurate than the data previously supplied, and evidence from Benchmark that the test was done wrong, which is helpful; but subsequent to that, you had almost the same levels, which may suggest that sampling is done at the wrong place—but I don't know. So, this is the data we have to go from, which came from JEC. From a hearing standpoint, I think JEC has to be able to show the Authority, not only that it is wrong, but what they should be billing, and why is the other number better than the first one that you supplied.

Bill Geiger said that he agreed with this. He said that he has a problem with the 4/4/2013 bill—it is an incomplete bill. It only tested for one thing. It only tested for the BOD, nothing else. So, we can't base anything on this bill.

Barry Dobil said that it would please him then if the BOA could base the bill on the most recent test dated July 7, 2014. He said that if you are going to put emphasis on those numbers, he will put equal emphasis on the numbers in the July 7th report.

Treasurer Klotz then said to Mr. Dobil that he actually has two parts of an appeal. That the period SWTA billed you for was wrong and needs to be recalculated, and that Mr. Dobil thinks SWTA should use the numbers from the July 7, 2014, test—Treasurer Klotz asked him if he would be happy with that?

Mr. Dobil said he would be happy with that and said for future consideration, not only would he want those 209,000 gallons adjusted, but also to consider having the water in question segregated to only include the water that is subject to fats, oils, and grease within the cooking facility.

Treasurer Klotz clarified then that the third thing we are asking for is the exclusion of the water.

Solicitor Marles also clarified that Mr. Dobil wants to segregate production water from normal domestic water and additionally went on to clarify with Treasurer Klotz that he is saying from his perspective, whichever gives JEC the lowest bill would be acceptable? Treasurer Klotz said that is correct—by testing at another location would drop the strength, and it might have a bigger impact.

Mr. Dobil said that he is not a sanitary engineer. But, is the concentration of sewage outside the kitchen greater with regard to BODs than that which is inside the kitchen? Attorney Malkames felt Mr. Dobil might have to hire someone to give an opinion on that.

Treasurer Klotz suggested a test done at the port and simultaneously one leaving the building, and then compare the numbers.

Solicitor Marles explains that the SWTA is not trying to up the numbers; they are attempting to meet the requirements of an agreement. However, the individual property owners can deal with it, and as long as it is reasonable (the test results), the Authority is going to say it is fine. But, when they get testing reports that have a number, they don't have a basis for billing differently. In terms of the data that JEC presented, the Authority doesn't control the reports presented with regard to data JEC presented, that's the data SWTA relies on to bill.

Craig Walls suggested that Mr. Dobil might want to talk to someone who can explain the process, explain the test results, and have them come up with a solution that helps minimize the problem.

Solicitor Marles explains that the bills the Authority is getting from the City of Allentown are to the point where the excess strength charges were higher than the volume charges. So, they had to do something because this is a cost that is passed on to everyone else.

Bill Geiger said he would be willing to look at the old bill and then the next bill right after it. And another thing, the bill which is almost last month—in July, he would accept that for this year for the first two quarters, the one dated 6/19. Solicitor Marles said that he would be paying based on that one for this year.

Solicitor Marles reminded that this challenge only relates to the \$7,000.

It was recommended that this be discussed in Executive Session.

Solicitor Marles said we can do that, but asked if there were any other questions that anyone might want to ask at this time?

Chairman D’Imperio said that we would be very happy to have your bill go down, because if your bill goes down, our bill goes down.

Mr. Dobil said that he would suspect that there are households within SWT using garbage disposals introducing more suspended solids into the system than JEC, yet your total charges are based on total eradication of the problem, but they are being billed to a select number of people who are paying the price.

Solicitor Marles said that the BOD, suspended solids, and TKN numbers are based upon the average domestic strengths that come through a system historically. That is how those numbers are derived. They are not our numbers. They are industry numbers—this is what most households generate.

Howard Kutzler explained that a huge part of these invoices is the BODs, not the nitrogen or suspended solids.

Craig Walls explained that the bill we get from Allentown is based on our test result that we submit to Allentown. We don’t take that bill and pass it over to you. We take the same data with the same multipliers, and we are charge by the City of Allentown, and then we hold you to that. We don’t take the bill we pay and divide it among everyone.

Mr. Dobil said, but the City of Allentown treats that water, and they come up with an expense—that this is what it cost us to treat this water. That is what they are charging SWTA, or your portion of it. Now, the charge that the City of Allentown is assessing is based on cleaning up everyone’s water, not just commercial entities. Yet, when you do your billing, it is an inequity—you are only billing commercial entities for correcting the problem.

Solicitor Marles said that it is not an inequity if the average domestic strength is that base number. This is what the industry says the average household generates. The theory behind this is that non-residential generates everything over and above those base numbers, because that is the average for a residence.

Attorney Malkames said we need to keep in mind JEC was billed for a period of time for which they should not have been billed.

Solicitor Marles said that we have two things to look at in terms of this appeal. He clarified that no one here cares if you want to segregate domestic from processed. From an appeal standpoint, the \$7,000 bill, the Authority is looking at the period of the billing, and the Authority should more equitably be looking at other data points than the original one that is used.

Mr. Dobil asked if we have a green light to install a separate meter on the water that is being used in the kitchen.

Again, Solicitor Marles confirmed that no one has any objection to that.

Bill Geiger advised Attorney Malkames and Barry Dobil that with regard to the appeal, they will hear something fairly quickly.

Howard Kutzler reminded Mr. Dobil to be sure to submit his test results to CodeMaster.

The hearing ended at 5:05P

5. COURTESY OF THE FLOOR: (Public comment on non-agenda items)

Cell Tower Issue – Presentation by David Jaindl.

David Jaindl and Joe Rutz were in attendance. Back in 1985 the Township condemned Joe's property at this location, which has an easement to service the Township with a water system out there. It was Mr. Rutz's understanding, and which was conveyed to Mr. Jaindl, that there was a restriction as to what the Township could and could not place on the property relative to cell towers. A tower was permitted, which was for Emergency Services only. The records that Mr. Rutz/Mr. Jaindl found show that there was a maximum restriction of 60 feet. Mr. Jaindl understands that the Township is looking to contract with Verizon for a cell tower at this location, much higher than 60 feet, which he said is a problem for them. He went on to show what they had planned for this property. He said it is a valuable piece of property and feels that a cell tower in a medium density area like this would be impossible. He said that if he came to the Township and made the same request on an R2 property, he said that it would not be permitted. Emergency Services makes sense, but to have an extended lattice pole on the property, he would fight that. He said that it is his understanding that the Township has changed the ordinance to permit this, without going through the normal process. He said that he would vehemently oppose this

on this property. Mr. Jaindl said he feels there are probably some alternatives that could be considered.

Solicitor Marles asked David if he could produce this agreement for us—that way we could confirm the ruling from the SWT ZHB which specifies the tower restrictions, which would clear this up immediately for everyone. He would first like to review it on behalf of the Authority. He explained that the current zoning ordinance does make this a permitted use on this location. David Jaindl said there was a ruling by the SWT ZHB which disallowed Omnipoint to put a cell tower up at this location. He said the deed restriction was issued by Maria Mullane, SWT ZHB. Solicitor Marles said that Verizon did a title search and could not find it. He is not saying it doesn't exist, it's just that he has not seen it. Mr. Jaindl said whether it exists or not, and he said it does exist, they will vehemently oppose the tower, with an extended pole, on the property. Solicitor Marles said under the current zoning ordinance, it does make this a permitted use. The only thing that can occur is if the BOA acts on a lease, if the BOA decides it wants a lease. Then they apply for a building permit, because there is no longer a zoning procedure since it is a permitted use. Howard said that the new ordinance exempts the Authority and the Township from any provisions in the zoning hearing ordinance—so there is no zoning procedure.

Chairman D'Imperio said that he is almost sure he was on the BOA at this time, and has no recollection of any kind of deed restriction—but is not saying it doesn't exist, just that he cannot recall one. He thought that perhaps this occurred when the Authority didn't exist, between 1991 and 1996, at which time it was being operated by the Township Commissioners. It is possible that something happened while the Commissioners were trying to operate the Township. Solicitor Marles said that maybe Omnipoint did not get approval, and if so, it would not have gotten to him as the Township Solicitor at that time.

Howard Kutzler, ATM, asked Mr. Jaindl if said document that we are talking about is indeed a ZHB document. Mr. Jaindl responded by saying based on what was just said, it would have been Township Commissioners at that time.

Craig Walls said that people are doing title searches and no one can find this document. He said two things need to happen. Someone needs to find this document that tells us we are not within our rights to put a tower there. Or, the second thing is that whether or not we have a right to put it there, you are coming to us today to reconsider. Craig went on to say that there are two parallel paths—find the document, because right now, none exists. And, we have to decide collectively that if this document doesn't exist, exactly what we want to do.

David Jaindl said that all he asks is that he is given another opportunity to come before the BOA before they vote on this. He said that there is a restriction and he will find it. He asked what would it take to have the Township subject to its own zoning. Howard said you would have to petition the BOC to amend the zoning ordinance.

Chairman D’Imperio asked Mr. Jaindl to explain why he was opposed to a tower on this property. Mr. Jaindl said to begin with, it will look terrible. This is an all Residential, R2, and you have \$500,000 single-family homes. He said that even if you can do this, to not do it, because you will be chastised by the neighbors for doing it. They can currently live with what is already there, but barely.

Howard asked Mr. Jaindl that if some other structure was suggested, such as a monopole or stealth, might that be considered by him? Mr. Jaindl said that on this property, no—however, they have a 10-acre parcel, which is part of this project on the other side of Brickyard, similar in elevation, but a smaller parcel. He would consider not opposing that—perhaps using a tree top proposal, which might work, in a wooded area, with similar elevation. Even though they control this piece, it would then be conveyed to the Township and he would not have an objection to a pole as such, which might be a reasonable proposal.

Solicitor Marles said—1) If Joe has the deed restriction, this is all moot; however, 2) if it doesn’t exist, then he asked Mr. Jaindl to give him a sketch for whatever it is that he would like to propose happen across the street so that he can look at that as an alternative, and for the BOA to consider.

Treasurer Klotz asked if it could be conveyed to the Authority? Mr. Jaindl said it could. Mr. Jaindl asked if he could propose an easement to the Authority? Solicitor Marles said that he could. Mr. Jaindl said if the BOA proposes this alternative, he would be agreeable to this and would work with the BOA to do an easement of some type, which Solicitor Marles again said could be done. He went on to say that all the cell tower company needs is a 50’ x 50’ lot, with driveway access, and the ability to run utilities in from Brickyard Road.

Craig Walls asked why we don’t work toward moving the tower to the other side if David doesn’t have a problem with it. Mr. Jaindl said he would get a sketch plan to Solicitor Marles for this new location. Solicitor Marles said that once he has the sketch plan, he can talk to Verizon with regard to this new location. Mr. Jaindl clarified that we would want this in the trees, in the existing wooded canopy where it blends in, and said he would have no problem with this. Solicitor Marles suggested a monopole painted green—Mr. Jaindl said he would have to see it first; however, he agreed that this might work.

Mr. Jaindl asked what type of income does the BOA receive for this. Solicitor Marles said that amount would be somewhere in the area of \$20,000/year. If other carriers are added on, that amount would go up.

In closing, Mr. Jaindl said that he would provide the sketch plan to Solicitor Marles. In turn, the BOA/Solicitor would share this with Verizon to see what they would have to say about it—see what Verizon’s concerns might be. David Jaindl said that he would come back to the October 20th meeting. Solicitor Marles added that currently the lease is not ready to go, and Mr. Jaindl would be heard before that; and, if we use a different location, the lease

would clearly not be ready to go. Mr. Jaindl asked that pictures of the green monopole, along with the tree topper pictures, be sent to him for his consideration—he would appreciate that. Solicitor Marles said he was told that there are no restrictions on any Authority property from a zoning perspective. Howard Kutzler, ATM, said the Township/Authority having this exemption allows them, through a process, uses that will benefit the whole community and not just one private land owner. Mr. Jaindl said he felt that the Township/Authority should be under the same restraints as everyone else in that they should not be allowed to do whatever they want to. Howard said that many, many municipalities do not subject themselves to zoning.

At this point, Mr. Jaindl thanked everyone for their time.

6. PRESENTATIONS/DISCUSSIONS: None.

7. REPORTS:

a. Authority Engineer Report: None.

b. Authority Solicitor Report:

- A letter was sent to LCA about the debt allocation regarding the discussion of 5% v. 6.2%. There has been some discussion whether the Shoemaker Jeep facility paid tapping fees. Mr. Jaindl is attempting to redevelop that property. Zator Law Firm, on Mr. Jaindl's behalf, has inquired about what the history is of those tapping charges. There was a fee paid, not for an allocation or a tapping fee, but probably relating to an assessment for the line going by their property. So, when they eventually develop that property, there will be a tapping fee, unless they can prove that a tapping fee was paid.

The Township vacated a portion of North 31st Street about 1½ years ago. When a street is vacated, to the extent that there is actually a vacation, the municipality loses all the rights and all the utilities lose rights to easements they have to the utility lines. Solicitor Marles wrote a letter to Attorney Zator, because the Authority was never notified that the sewer line in that street may have lost its easement. Zator said someone would get back to Solicitor Marles from his office. Based on case law, the utilities may lose their rights, which is something that needs to be resolved.

- We now have information from The Pidcock Company with regard to tapping fees—the staff was going back and forth on this. Howard Kutzler, ATM, handed out a letter on this for everyone's perusal. Solicitor Marles said the goal was to change the tapping fee structure. The fees have gone up substantially. Will be put on the agenda for next month.
 - There is a discussion going on now between LCA and the Authority relating to the swap out of sewer meters. We are not sure where this stands right now. LCA has taken the stand that in order for the Authority to swap out its sewer meters, it needs to get permission from the other players. They haven't indicated the basis for this. Currently there is a discussion going on.
-

- Intern to do the deed work regarding what easements does the Authority and Township own. (The Authority doesn't know where its easements are.) Solicitor Marles suggested to Mike Shafer at ZLO that this might be a task for the Township to undertake instead of the Authority—they don't know where their easements are either. It would be cheaper to do all of that at one time. Mike said he would take that up with the commissioners.
 - Need to do the KRE Agreement relating to the apartment complex and the ability to put the public water system in the private streets.
 - Bill Geiger asked about the Verizon Agreement. Solicitor Marles said he went back and forth regarding changes to the document and is very close to a final document. However, all that was talked about today changes all of that, but the basic format of the document won't change unless they change their numbers based on a monopole.
- c. **CodeMaster Reports:**
- 1) **Industrial Waste Discharge Program Summary – dated September 5, 2014 (page 19) - FYI.**
- d. **Monthly Public Works Utility Report – September 2014 (page 21) – FYI.**
- 1) **I&I Subcommittee Minutes – September 8, 2014 (page 25) – FYI.**
 - 2) **Monthly Clearwater Inspector's Report – September 8, 2014 (page 29) – FYI.**
 - 3) **SWTA Sanitary Sewer System I&I Evaluation Reports for: Sewer Mains and Manholes (page 31) – FYI.**
 - a. **Articles – Restoration Pipe Hub and Trenchless Technology (page 39) – FYI.**
 - 4) **Proposed Subdivisions (page 47) – FYI.**
- e. **Secretary Correspondence:**
- 1) **Email from Emily F. Gerber re-LCA/SWTA Billing (page 49) –FYI.**
8. **BID AWARDS:**
- a. **Bid Award: Bid #2014-04; Sewer Main Repairs and Manhole Rehabilitation – Contract Return Letter Fully Executed Municipal Contract (page 51) – FYI.**
9. **RESOLUTIONS:**
- a. **A Resolution Authorizing and Directing Neffs National Bank to Deposit in the Checking Account of South Whitehall Township Authority Certain Loan Proceeds in the Amount of \$_____ Pursuant to the Authority's Revenue Note, Series of 2014, Dated June 30, 2014 for the Purposes Authorized by Resolution 2014-06-BOA Adopted June 5, 2014 (page 59).**

The above is the format that will be used when the Authority draws down on the loan.

b. **A Resolution Amending the Authority's Schedule of Rates, Rents and Charges for Furnishing Sewerage Services to Customers (page 65)**

A motion was made by Treasurer Rick Klotz, and seconded by Bill Geiger, to approve the Resolution Amending the Authority's Schedule of Rates. All in favor; none opposed.

10. **MOTIONS:**

a. **Interoffice Memorandum from Public Works Manager Robert Ibach Regarding Destruction of Archived Documents (page 81)**

A motion was made by Chairman D'Imperio and seconded by Treasurer Klotz, authorizing Bob Ibach, PWM, to destroy the old Water Main Assessment Bills. All in favor; none opposed.

11. **OLD BUSINESS:**

a. **SWTA Manager Search** – Tabled.

b. **Verizon Cell Tower Lease – Solicitor Marles – Memo dated August 22, 2014 (page 83)** Discussed earlier in the meeting as mentioned above.

c. **Discussion – Transitioning of all Water Metered Customers to Sewer Metered Customers (page 87)**

A motion was made by Treasurer Rick Klotz to make the transition from flat rate to metered (those who have both water & sewer) to take effect at the discretion of staff, with the implementation of Munis, January 1, 2015. The motion was seconded by Bill Geiger. All in favor; none opposed.

Bill Geiger said that we need to be sure to notify customers ahead of time—several weeks ahead of time. Absolutely all customers need to get notification. Craig Walls added that communication to our residents has to be the key. It needs to be carefully crafted. Chairman D'Imperio suggested one mailing to everyone should be done. It will need to be posted to the website and in the newspaper. Howard Kutzler, ATM, added that the BOC also needs to be advise as to what is being done with regard to all of this because the residents will go to them with their questions and ask what is going on.

12. **NEW BUSINESS - DIRECTION/DISCUSSION ITEMS:**

Bob Ibach, PWM, did not see any problem with the two requests (allocation/hookup—12-a & 12-b) below.

A motion was made by Treasurer Klotz, and seconded by Chairman D'Imperio to approve both the Water/Sewer Allocation/Application Request for 2817 Pacific Avenue, Orefield, PA 18069 and for the Water/Sewer Tapping Application Request for 2817 Pacific Avenue, Orefield, PA 18069. All in favor; none opposed.

- a. **Water/Sewer Allocation Application – Kevin Wehr, Project Address – 2817 Pacific Avenue, Orefield, PA 18069 (page 93)**
- b. **Water/Sewer Tapping Application – Kevin Wehr, Project Address – 2817 Pacific Avenue, Orefield, PA 18069 (page 97)**

13. TREASURER’S REPORT:

- a. **Financials – August – See Authority Reports Packet**

Treasurer Rick Klotz made a motion to approve the water and sewer bills for the August 2014 Financials, based on the invoices listed, which have been provided by the Administration, and as recommended by the Treasurer, and moved to ratify bills paid last month, and approve bills to be paid in the current month, as funds become available. (As required by the Authority’s Act.) The Motion was seconded by Chairman D’Imperio. All in favor; none opposed (4-0 Vote).

Lenore Horos, FM, explained that we are working to finalize the audits. Staff will be back on Thursday of this week. Looking to have things wrapped up by the end of October for 2012 and 2013.

Treasurer Klotz said that he would like to have these before the 2015 Budget is approved.

Lenore Horos, FM, said that Kristin Hlay has been hired to assist with utility billings. Kristin has processed all the meters changed out/final invoices and have gone out.

An ad has been run for a second utility clerk. Over 100 applications received.

Craig Walls asked if there will be any kind of budget information at the next meeting. Bill Geiger said that a partial review would be good. Lenore said she will bring something for the next meeting.

Commissioner Tori Morgan will be talking to the BOC with regard to when they can jointly meet with the BOA. Shooting for immediately following the next BOA meeting date, at 6P.

- b. **Authority Delinquents as of September 10, 2014 (See Authority Reports Packet)**

Treasurer Klotz said that we really need to start collecting this money that is due us. Craig Walls agreed, too, that we need to start taking action. Howard Kutzler and Treasurer Klotz both said we need to get some statements out, because as of the end of 2013 the delinquents have not been actively pursued. Craig Walls said that he feels we should go with Portnoff—we do not have the time and energy to handle the delinquents the way they need to be handled. He felt we should let them do it. Chairman D’Imperio wants to hold off on going with Portnoff for now; Bill Geiger agreed with this, too. Lenore Horos, FM, to advise at next meeting the progress being made. Chairman D’Imperio wants to see what happens in the next thirty days regarding all this.

- c. **Line of Credit (page 101) – FYI.**
- d. **2013 Exceptional Strength Sewerage Invoices & 2014 Exceptional Strength Sewerage Billings (page 103)**
- e. **Year 2014 Water & Sewer Connection Tapping Fees (page 107)**
- f. **Approval of Stevens & Lee Legal Invoices: Report Packet (See Authority Reports Packet)**

A motion was made by Treasurer Klotz, and seconded by Bill Geiger to approve the Stevens & Lee Invoice #423880 below. All in favor; none opposed.

<u>Date</u>	<u>Invoice #</u>	<u>Amount</u>
08/21/2014	423880	\$4,756.25

- g. **Approval of The Pidcock Company Engineering Invoices: None.**
- 14. **NON-AGENDA ITEMS: None.**
 - 15. **EXECUTIVE SESSION: None.**
 - 16. **ADJOURNMENT:** A motion was made by Bill Geiger and seconded by Craig Walls to adjourn at 7:15 p.m. All in favor; none opposed.
 - 17. **APPROVED: October 20, 2014**
On October 20, 2014, a motion was made by Bill Geiger and seconded by Dan D’Imperio, to approve the September 15, 2014, Board of Authority Minutes. All in favor; none opposed.