

Shippensburg Borough Authority

Special Meeting Agenda

October 20, 2016

7:00 p.m.

Roll Call: _____ Michael Pimental, Chairman
_____ Steve Brenize, Vice-Chairman
_____ Troy Pomeroy, Member
_____ Kerri Burrows, Member
_____ Evaggelos Tsambiras, Member
_____ Forest Myers, Esq.
_____ Dennis Hammaker, P.E.
_____ Peggy Miller, Rettew Eng.

1. Business Items

- a. Discussion/Consideration to Acquire the Southern Cumberland Water Association
By the Shippensburg Borough Authority
- b. Consideration to Pursue Grants through the PA Small Water & Sewer Program
(Submittal Deadline is October 31, 2016)
 - Southern Cumberland Water Association
 - Lurgan Booster Pump Station
- c. Discussion/Consideration to Relocate Study Area for Proposed Well # 4

2. Any Other Business

Adjournment

Next Regular Meeting
November 8, 2016

Shippensburg Borough Authority Minutes
Special Meeting Agenda
October 20, 2016
7:00 pm

Present:

Michael Pimental (MP) Steve Brenize (SB) Troy Pomeroy (TP) Kerri Burrow (KB)
Evaggelos Tsambiras (ET) Dennis Hammaker (DH) John Epley (JE) Peggy Miller (PM)

Absent:

Mark Ryder (MR)

1. **Business Items:**

a. **Discussion/Consideration to Acquire the Southern Cumberland Water Association by The Shippensburg Borough Authority**

(MP) This agreement was put together in 2014 and it laid out a path forward for the SBA and the SCWA to merge. So I thought it prudent to have this in front of and we can go through here and check off those things that have been taken care of, and those things that may be outstanding and it may also engender more conversation about some matters that need greater depth to them. So under **Legal Matters**

1. The Authority, by its Solicitor, shall undertake a review of the legal status of the SCWA to determine SCWA's ability to transfer the water system it operates and how it may be properly transferred.

(FM) I have reviewed their documentation, such as it is, it is not a corporation or a LLC so it is just an association, and each one of the members they pay their membership fee and as they pay that. They become a member of the SCWA and as part of that association they are basically the stockholders, the owners however you want to characterize it. What would be required is to have a vote of the majority of the stockholders, or a majority of the members of the association vote affirmably to transfer the ownership of the assets to the authority. So that part of it is fairly straightforward and it requires some notice etc., but it is straightforward in that sense.

(SB) I have a question on that; I just want to understand how that functions. So did a majority of all of them or a majority of whomever shows up at a meeting that they have been notified of?

(FM) It would be a majority of whoever shows up at the meeting.

(SB) So they send out letters to everybody and everybody gets their letters and 5 shows up and 3 votes for it, so then those 3 are the deciding for the entire association.

(FM) yes, as long as they have notice and that is important they get the correct notice of the meeting the purpose of the meeting, the date the time the place, what is going to transpire. My sense would be that they should notify them exactly of what the purpose of the meeting is, SCWA would dissolve and transfer its assets to the SBA.

(SB) So us doing our due diligence would it be right for us to request that when the final notice goes out for this final vote that it would be done using certified mail?

(FM) it is probably overkill, but I think it should go out that way.

(SB) I was just asking, so no one could say that they didn't know.

2. (MP) it is obviously premature to produce some of these documents

(FM) to be honest I haven't done any, until a decision is made that you are going to go forward, I am not going to spend your money, or their money to do this. If it comes down to it then ill prepare the documents.

3. (MP) This is the Department of Agriculture loan, and in this case we were asking back in 2014 to have that loan assigned to it, so that it assigned to the SBA under the same terms and conditions

as the SCWA has it. But it seems like since then we have had other discussions that the nature of the loan with the USDA is in fact higher than current rates. And perhaps it might be wiser to put this away and simply borrow.

(FM) I have a letter from the USDA RD which administers the loan and the loan was taken out in March of 2006 so it has run 10 years, it is a 40 year loan and it has a 4.25% term and the amount of the loan is probably in the financials that were given to you by Mr. Hershey. There are no prepayment penalties and they don't say they have to, but they say they may approve same rates and terms and transfer the assumptions to a public body or a municipality or authority if you continue the original purpose of the loan. But you would be assuming all of the borrower SCWA responsibilities regarding that loan. So it would be a straightforward process, and not a lot of paperwork that would be involved, but the question is could you get a better rate or better terms.

(MP) a better rate or better terms that means that we could lower, the rate that they are paying for water, because if we get a lower rate than the rate to them is lower on each of their bills, right?

(FM) right

(MP) So that could be step 1. So let's tie that together with the \$300,000 in improvements that are needed out there.

(FM) So you are actually looking at borrowing that money, that would be, you would be borrowing approximately \$600,000 depending on the term of the loan. They have been paying down now since 2006.

(MP) so \$600,000, you have the document in front of you, it's this one with the with the color stripes on it, that is from Dan Hershey, he sent it in an email after our meeting last week. He did some more number crunching looking at if we in fact borrowed money in order to take care of the improvements that are necessary out there. What that might look like, scenario #3 here includes the application of \$126,000 in reserve funds. So in other words we would be loaning if you will the SCWA cash that we have, and we could be charging them some interest rate on those dollars as they pay it back.

(FM) Are you sure that he is not, he is not applying the money they have in their accounts?

(MP) Maybe that is what he meant by that.

(SB) so we are basically going to subtract that

(MP) I had a conversation with him, about loaning some of our own funds and transferring it and charging them an interest rate that a bank would be charging so that we would be make the interest rate on those dollars instead of a bank, same scenario slightly different. If you look at the last scenario #3 using their reserves, if you look at per quarter per customer you can see that those are much more reasonable sums than what we were looking at toward the conclusion of our meeting a couple Tuesdays ago. To me when I look at this, this looks feasible it looks like a rate that would not be burdensome to most folks and to me it makes the path forward more palatable.

(SB) These are the numbers for the upgrade

(KB) for the improvements

(SB) for the improvements

(KB) it is not really an upgrade

(SB) So for the improvements and then on top of that we would roll the loan into that, so you are looking at \$300,000? What is the value of the loan?

(FM) in rough terms about \$300,000

(MP) So we would be doubling that number

(SB) looking at 35 or 36 if we get 2% or 40 if we got 3% for a 30 year loan.

(JE) Michael this would also be on top of their regular payment correct?

(MP) yes

(JE) this would be in addition to

(MP) yes, their regular payment would go down a smidge

4. (MP) This is looking for all the contracts easements, deeds, etc.; do you have these things Forest?

(FM) I have what was been represented to me as those things,

(MP) are they all of them or not, you don't know right?

(FM) no, you don't know, they represented the same thing to me for huckleberry land and I found many more things afterwards. I still look every now and then when I have a little bit of time; in the court documents in the courthouse to see if I can find anything. But I believe that I have the copies of the agreements and the contracts and the deeds and some of the easements. I am not convinced at this point that I have all of the easements. Sometimes, with these I have found out with huckleberry land is, it is not something where they diligently go out and get the easements and then put the water line in sometimes, especially in Huckleberry, they put the water line in and sometimes they got an easement and sometimes they didn't.

5. (FM) the fifth one goes hand in glove with the 1st one that is the meeting evidence that the members agree to transfer according to their bylaws which I reviewed.

(MP) Alright **Financial Matters**

1. (MP) Do we have two recent years' audits? Have you seen those? Do you know of those?

(FM) I do not; I think the person that, it seems to me that Ed Goodhart did indicate that he did have them.

(KB) It seems to me, that I recall us having them.

(SB) At some point I remember somebody saying that we had them

(MP) I kind of thought so too.

2. (MP) How about current Financial Statements?

(KB) it is the same thing, I am pretty certain we were told we had those as well

(SB) We had the yellow sheet and then we had something else

(KB) it would have been the middle of last year

(MP) we still need the most current before we go forward

3. (MP) and again recent statements concerning the CD, checking and savings accounts?

(FM) I think Hershey gave you that didn't he?

(SB) Would it be our due diligence for the financial matters to send back out and say hey we are getting closer and we are making progress, we are doing some research we need your financial records again because we haven't had them for a year.

(FM) I think that would be the wise thing to do

(MP) I like that good plan, so request all 6 of these again

(MP) We can jump to **Engineering and Operations**

1. (MP) 1. Is taken care of

2. (MP) it was done differently

3. (MP) so how about the business with the meters?

4. (FM) wasn't that part of \$300,000

(PM) It does say install radio heads on all meters \$30,000 and install master meter on mobile home park line \$55,000

(KB) Well they are installing the master meter

(SB) I think the point of 4 was at that time we knew that was a definite expense as we continue to research and we see more that we need to actually spend to get them on our system and to be a functional part of our system. There has been other expense that has come about because of it, and this was a definite expense that we knew up front, we knew we were going to have to get new meters and we wanted to make sure that in this contract it was stated in there. That they

understood and that they were going to be paying for it. We weren't taken them over and because they had \$126,000 we were just going to use that money to put their meters that they were going to be responsible for putting their meters in.

(KB) There meters are fine, it is just that they need the radio reads

(PM) And that is included in the \$300,000

(KB) And they were going to put the master meter in, but there is some disagreement between what they thought they needed

(DH) I was involved in the review of that also and I was waiting on the outcome of tonight on how to proceed with that. The originally proposed a 6" meter and it looked like the accuracy of that large of a meter to regulate flows was going to be too large. I suggested reducing that to a 4" meter that could both take care of normal flows accurately but also allow a fire flow to be passed. That is where we are right now, we are down to making a decision on the exact model that is needed and something from you that say yes we should proceed and allow them to do that.

(MP) that is an unfinished item at this time

(MP) Under **Miscellaneous**

4. (MP) The Authority will make available to Southern Cumberland Water Association, Inc. any report or reports it shall have produced from the review of SCWA's records. Well that would include this engineering review

(SB) we should make sure that they get a copy of it

(MP) In that engineer review, is the information that they need, a better meter for out there for that trailer park, so that all becomes part of it?

(TP) How many? 163 customers, I am assuming if they put a master meter on the park only, we wouldn't have to replace anything in the park, so what is the balance of regular customers throughout the system. The park is one customer, people that live in the park are not SCWA members, and it is the same as Mobile Estates. Mobile Estates people don't get a water bill they get a lot bill from the owner.

(KB) countryside do they have their own individual meters

(FM) Countryside has individual meters

(TP) there is not a master meter down there now

(FM) Where

(KB) how are they charging the park

(DH) I think there are individual meters at the trailer park right now

(TP) so is that one of that goes back to what Steve said the Park is included in the 163.

(SB) the park is number 163, so there are 162 regular users and then the park

(KB) Even though each individual right now has its own meter? That is what Dennis is saying.

(ET) what park are we talking about because you brought in Mobile Estates

(KB) We are talking about the trailer park in Lees Cross Roads.

(DH) I was led to believe that there were meters on each of the trailers in the trailer park right now

(SB) So each one of them is a member?

(DH) I don't know about that, in the discussion about the meter I was just led to believe that there were individual meters and the association was losing a lot of revenue because the piping within the trailer park is leaked and now they want to account for that and not make the association pay for that but make the trailer park pay for it

(MP) I think they all had individual meters but the trailer park paid the bill, so that was the trailer parks way of collecting from all of their tenants.

(ET) that was a way to understand how much each tenant owed

(KB) That doesn't answer Troy's question whether or not they are 163 or whether they are 145-163.

(TP) Do we need 165 remote meters or do we need 100?

(KB) How large is that trailer park?

(TP) that will affect the improvements

(KB) Does anybody have any idea how big it is?

(FM) Here is the agreement; right now what they are doing is called base line billing. This is the agreement that they entered into with velocity partners with Jones of the park. Base line billing for the water consumed by the Indian Spring Manor residents will be determined by quarterly readings taken from the individual water meters of each service line, the recorded usage will be billed at the same rates then in affect for other members of the SCWA established etc., an additional quarterly water flow reading will be taken at a new entry point meter which is the 6" or 4" meter, that is going to be located on the owners main water line. At the time of each quarterly reading of the individual service line meters a reading of the total flow recorded at the entry point will also be taken.

(KB) That adds a tremendous amount of administrative costs to us because then we are going to be adding the 45 lots and subtracting it from the master reads

(TP) let the trailer company or the mobile home park pay that

(JE) We are only going to read the main meter

(ET) we will charge then for the one meter

(KB) So the trailer park was going to read the other 45

(FM) In this agreement SCWA is going to read

(SB) the way they are currently doing it and what they put that in place is because the holes in the lines, so instead of fixing the lines, they are going to pay for the water that is being lost in between the entry point and the individual people's houses. So there are 45 houses, there are 45 users they are each using how many gallons and then there is a certain number of gallons that is going into the ground. The trailer park is paying for the gallons that are going into the ground.

(KB) What I am saying is, if we take them over we have to honor all of the agreements that they have entered, which includes that one and as of right now, we are adding administrative costs and it makes more sense that we would read the master meter.

(JE) I know what that says and it needs to be looked at

(ET) I have a question here

(JE) We don't want to add and subtract and see who is paying what, we want to read the one meter and that's it.

(MP) the one meter and they have to pay that bill and then they get it from their customers anyway they want.

(ET) we are supposed to be good stewards of the earth, if water is being lost shouldn't we require those people

(SB) that is an avenue we can go down, we can negotiate it with this trailer park

(KB) they don't know how much water is being lost, they are just assuming that there is water being lost.

(SB) they haven't put anything in, they don't know what is being lost?

(DH) it is not installed, the master meter

(KB) they are still discussing what size they are going to get

(MP) Angelo's point I think when they merge with us, one of the statements, in the agreements is that they have to follow all our rules and regulations. The rules and regulations would make them responsible for that water.

(ET) So that would be on the owner of the trailer park

(SB) To his point, I think I know where he is going with this. If we are investigating this right now and our goal bringing this system online as part of our system, should be to do it the best way possible and if we know right now there is water being lost from their system that is going into the ground instead of being used for the use of water customers. Should we broach these lines need fixed?

(KB) but we don't know that and we don't know the magnitude of it

(ET) I am saying I see this somewhere along the line I see this coming back to bite us when we find out that we put the master meter on. And we find out there is a loss (I am going to pick a number) 10,000 gallons and that is a lot of water.

(KB) here is my theory, we put the master meter in and that is the one they are getting billed for and the trailer park is in charge of the other 45 and they start to read those and they are like whoa wait a second I am paying for 10k more a month than I should be. That will entice them to want to replace the water lines, because they are paying for water that they are not getting.

(ET) I know but back to Mikes point, if our rules say water leaks need to be repaired.

(KB) we are not going to have any idea that they have water leaks because we are not going to be reading those 45 individual meters.

(JE) because they are private service lines

(SB) Our rules say that water lines have to be repaired from the main line to the meter; anything on the other side of the meter is their responsibility. And now if they end up having an issue, that is where the forgiveness with people come in, where basically their line busts and all of the sudden they are spending \$1000 on a typical \$100 water bill, they come and ask for forgiveness because on their end they fixed their line. But they are only responsible if something from the main to the meter is then we force them

(KB) it is going to result when the master meter is installed it is not going to be any of our business.

(MP) Unless in the future we decide to take a very strong stance about wasted water and we could then start to go out and test for leaks, and mandate that they be repaired.

(SB) I don't know if we can test for leaks on lines that aren't ours

(JE) We won't know, because we are going to have one reading,

(KB) they are going to know, depending on how catastrophic the water loss is, they are not going to want to pay for massive water, right now they are passing that cost onto their lot owners and maybe they still will, maybe they will divide it 45 ways as opposed to just fixing the lines. But it seems to me that would entice them to make the improvements so they are not paying the additional costs. But that agreement has to be changed because that is going to put an extreme administrative burden on the water authority, in my opinion.

(SB) What it does, as we are adding this, the extra rate to it, is also going to apply to the trailer park in the amount equivalent to another rate payer. So they are going to have a higher rate too because of...

(ET) They are getting a deal, I don't know how many trailers are in there but they are getting one rate for that master and then those guys are splitting the cost on that. Well then maybe what we do, whenever we are passing the cost on is we pass it on based on volume not on a user pays each this much we base it on a volume. If you use this much water, whatever the base water usage is, which I imagine based on the size of the houses out there. A majority of them are going to use right around the minimum amount and just prorate it.

(SB) you have to make sure however we do this, that we don't end up the non-trailer park portion of the association isn't paying for the trailer park owners, not the trailer residents but the trailer park owners that we help them get through this.

(ET) last question and then I will shut up. Right now everybody has a meter out there and the leaks appear to be from the main to the meter, those tenants aren't paying for any water loss.

(KB) right, currently that is why we are putting in a master meter

(DH) the association is paying for it right now, I think that is why the association is putting pressure on them to put the meter in because they know that is the case.

(PM) the report basically says that they are leaks and it says that the water mains and the service lines were installed without inspection there are concerns that inferior construction methods were used due to the significant number of leaks and the slow reaction of the park owners to repair the leaks. The SWCA has decided to install a master meter pit, thereby metering any water loss on the mains in the park, this would make all the water facilities downstream of the master meter the responsibility of the park. Do you really think the park is going to fix the leaking lines? They don't have to. Well they are going to pay one way or another.

(SB) Basically they are equitably paying for the water that they are using and it becomes more cost effective for them to fix the lines instead of paying for the water.

(KB) right and they can only pass so much of that cost on, because it is a trailer park and they are on fixed incomes so they can't pass a massive cost increase on to their tenants, they just can't or it will be cost prohibitive.

(FM) Well the issue you have with the mobile home park is, they have approval for I think 139 lots, I read it somewhere recently,

(DH) 190

(FM) 190 lots, now they only have 39 currently used, if they decide to continue to the development then

(KB) then the customer base grows almost doubles

(FM) not only that but then they have to come back to the authority, if the authority takes it over and install it according to the authorities rules and regulations and specifications. And at that time you may be wanting to require them to update the entire system.

(KB) Right but as of right now they are grandfathered in and we can't do it now, because they are grandfathered in

(MP) they would need approval so we could make that contingent upon other improvements

(SB) so if they have approval for 190, have they paid for 190?

(FM) no

(DH) good point

(SB) so if they haven't paid for 190 and then they come into our system they are no longer approved for 190. They are approved for 39.

(FM) they are approved for 190 in the township, but they aren't approved for 190 EDUs I guess you call it.

(PM) what are they approved with SCWA?

(SB) so what you are saying is that we have to honor all agreements and their agreement was to put these in there when they add another trailer park, then they have to give us the same, What is the current cost to join the association?

(FM) \$2,000

(SB) so it is not quite a whole tapping fee, but every time they add another trailer they have to give us \$2,000 if we are honoring the contract

(KB) except for we are only considering them 1 customer

(ET) so did that person pay for the 190 units or 39 units or did he only pay for the one?

(FM) my guess would be that he paid for 39

(TP) I would too, because he has 39

(FM) he didn't pay for 190 that is a good point Angelo, because once this master meter gets installed does that mean that is their system?

(KB) that is what it would mean to me

(FM) That is exactly the way SME works, they can add on whatever they want. I think the one out at bonny brook on Orrstown road might be the same, I am not sure if they have one meter or if all those mobile homes are individually metered.

(ET) At SME you were getting ready to say that, we don't know what goes on back there all we do is charge the rate for that one meter.

(FM) exactly, they could add 100 units back there if they have the land

(ET) who puts the meter in

(FM) I don't know if they even have meters individually.

(KB) the master meter

(FM) the master meter was put in by the authority

(KB) I would imagine that they really don't care; it is part of their lot rent. They are going to take, they get a water bill of \$6000 and have a hundred tenants they are going to divide it evenly. It doesn't matter if lot 65 uses 10 times the water that lot 22 does. I mean think about it as an apartment complex where utilities are included. They take the utility and they split it among open tenants, they don't say that 4A uses more than 4C. I mean that is just not how it works

(FM) I mean I can tell you, the way SME is set up they pay one bill and whatever that bill is it is based upon a master meter at the entrance of the park. This was a discussion that was had when this happened well what about the tapping fees. Well it is there system, your responsibility as an authority ends at that meter.

(SB) but haven't we changed precedence by the interaction with the university on this. The university is the same situation, where the university has three meters that come in and we basically look at the water usage that they are using and if they are using more water than they are supposed to we send them a bill for EDUs.

(ET) do we do that at the trailer park?

(SB) that is what I am saying I don't think that we do.

(KB) but that was an agreement that we specifically with Shippensburg University where they came to us and said we are going to use this many EDUs and they are using over. We would do that no different with Schreiber, unless we completely rewrote an agreement with the trailer park and we would have to do it with all of them, we can't just single out the Lees Crossroads.

(SB) that is what I am asking do we need to look at our bulk users and do we need to within our bylaws put something in for bulk users.

(KB) That would be apartment complexes

(SB) I understand that I am just saying do we need to do that?

(ET) but in an apartment complex when they built that, they paid us so many EDUs

(MP) for the number of units they were going to put up.

(FM) Deerfield is a good example

(ET) but at SME, I hate picking on them, just using them as an example, SME if they came along and said we are going to put 200 units in here and they paid for 200 units of EDUs and now they are up to 400, did we miss some EDUs there?

(SB) I don't think that retroactively we are going to be able to do anything. My question is do we need to look at something in the bylaws now, like we did with the university. Where we defined their current EDUs, here is what your current EDUs are we can't go back and charge you for EDUs that you added over the years because we didn't choose to do the right thing at the time and make sure you were paying for them or whatever. We didn't have a contract that allowed us to do so, but

moving forward here is your EDUs here is what your EDUs are defined as, as your EDUs go up we are going to send you a bill for your new EDUs.

(FM) I think historically, I don't even know if there were tapping fees paid on SME.

(KB) I think that is probably what it is. The thing with Shippensburg is everything is so old here; you don't have a lot of new development, especially these trailer parks. They are not new; SME has existed for probably what 70yrs?

(FM) at least 60

(KB) so you figure, 70 years ago the rules and regulations were a little bit different, Roxbury Ridge Apartments is probably the same thing, they have been around for 50 plus years, so we probably didn't charge them the same way we charged Deerfield.

(MP) So how do we do this with these historical properties? So a historical customer, let's say a trailer park or whatever it may be, so the bylaw says, it would say what? We going to monitor annually or bi-annually for water use and if you are using more than, you know how do we set the EDUs for that?

(KB) I have no idea how you would do that?

(MP) it is kind of arbitrary unless we go through and say okay right now you have so many units that would be so many EDUs, that you never paid for by the way. And so if you use more water than that in the future you are going to have to pay EDUs.

(SB) I think that is what we do

(MP) and then for what timeframe, a year, 5 years, 10 years, 20 years, how far out can we do that?

(KB) Trailer parks are unique because it is literally the land itself that the tenants are renting, the structure that they are residing in, a lot of times are privately owned. So you can have a 3 bedroom trailer there with one bathroom for a year, and then the following year, has a double wide with two bathrooms. I mean so it does fluctuate, I guess that same could be said about an apartment. I guess you could have somebody move in that is a heavy water user, but I think it would fluctuate substantially more with mobile home parks because the actual structure that uses the water is owned by somebody different than the person that owns the actual physical land.

(MP) So let's try to bring this back to our problem with the trailer park. Are we saying that the remedy to our problem with the trailer park situation is a change in our bylaws? Is that we are suggesting?

(SB) I am

(FM) Which trailer park?

(MP) the one with SCWA

(KB) In my opinion the only way that it matters because, we would have to honor all of their agreements, if the trailer park at Lees Crossroads that is part of SCWA goes full board and they instantly fill up all 190 lots filled. Let's just say it does, does it affect our ability to be able to serve those customers? And if it doesn't, then ultimately they are still going to be paying the water that it is going to cost them to furnish those 190 units.

(MP) They are paying for the water but they are not contributing toward the improvements towards the infrastructure of the system that allows them to develop their business.

(KB) Do we currently have something in our bylaws for bulk users?

(SB) That is what my thought is, we have bulk users in there, but I think it might be...

(KB) how do we charge Chateau Terrace? Does anybody know?

(FM) I think it is on a meter.

(KB) one meter?

(FM) I think one meter per building

(ET) one meter per building or per unit?

(FM) there is more than one building, so I think each building has a separate meter. Now Deerfield each individual apartment has a meter

(KB) That is right because it is a newer apartment complex that is why I was using Chateau Terrace specifically or even College Park, I mean that is the same thing. I imagine it is probably one meter per building or one meter per the entire complex. How do we bill them? Do we charge them a bulk rate?

(FM) That is an interesting question that should probably be answered, because I am not sure that they aren't on the university system.

(KB) but they were privately owned until a couple of years ago. Bard Meadows is newer but they are still 25 to 30 years old. I can't imagine that they have individual meters either, if we look at some of these apartment complexes. Roxbury Ridge, Chateau Terrace, the bigger ones, College Park, Bard Meadows I am not sure about because it is newer, but those other three they have been around forever!

(FM) keep in mind anything that was built before 1988, if it wasn't in the borough there were no tapping fees

(KB) Well Bard meadows was before 1988

(FM) Because the tariff we had with the PUC didn't allow for tapping fees outside of the borough.

(SB) I think it is worth looking at this and looking at the contract that we have with the university and the contract that we have with Schreiber and looking at the language we placed in there on how we define usage and how then if their usage increases it becomes an increase in EDUs and therefore there is a bill due.

(ET) I think we also need to check when that trailer park was put in, when they put the meters in, did they charge per each meter, the \$2000? Because you said it was a \$2000 association fee or was it one association fee?

(SB) I think that is something to research on the that end of it

(KB) We need to know if they are considered customer 139-160 or if they are considered customer 163, we need to know that, because that is going to affect our bottom line when it comes to these numbers as well.

(SB) basically if it is 39 people, then 39 peoples worth of the expense goes to the trailer park

(PM) look at appendix H, it says that the customers are listed, I don't have Appendix H, it says that the customers are listed in Appendix H.

(KB) I don't have Appendix H

(FM) I have it,

(ET) Who owns it?

(SB) Velocity

(FM) Velocity Partners, we have in the second quarter of 2016, according to their records there were 35 connections in Indian Springs that is what it is called. But there is a note here that says they paid for 39 connections.

(KB) so they have 4 empty lots, now does that answer the question that they are customer 163 or are they customer 127-?

(FM) they could not be customer 163, because there is no way to be 163, unless the owner of the property is paying 35 water bills then sending them on to the customer.

(SB) So then those water users are currently members 139-?

(KB) So we need 39 less radio readers.

(ET) Yes, but we also need to put the provision in there that anybody else or expansion of that property they owe whatever that association fee is going to be.

(MP) they fall under our rules, from starting with number 39

(SB) Which is why we are almost going to have to reinvestigate our bulk user?

(KB) We have to; quite frankly we should be doing it anyways because we do have so many historical bulk users

(MP) John, looking into these bulk users this almost kind of dovetails into what we were talking about with the other issue.

(JE) I am writing down how we are dealing with these bulk customers, mobile homes and apartment buildings, so I will talk to Nicole and Kristina and see how this is occurring. I was just asking Dennis, if the flows increase with the main meter into the mobile home park and we see that on a monthly basis they keep increasing EDUs, can we charge them for a new EDU?

(MP) According to the bylaws, the way I understand it, we have a two year window to do that, from when we give permission, like a two year window to look at, we can change the bylaw and see what makes sense. I don't think it can be forever, I think there has to be some kind of limitation.

(KB) we do have to be careful because the renting populations in town are either students and those properties are run down or they are low income users, so we have to be vigilant that we are not chasing people out of town, specifically I am talking about the borough. A lot of these apartment complexes that I talked about are not in the borough, College Park, Bard Meadows, Roxbury Ridge, none of those are in the borough.

(SB) A well written bylaw this is for when we have a bulk user that right now is using water for 50 uses, for 50 apartments or 50 individuals and then they go from 50 individuals to now they add on, they taken an apartment complex that has 15 apartments and they subdivide it, because somebody lets them do it into 30 apartments.

(KB) Well Bard Meadows, every time I am there, there is a new building and now the place behind CJ's, that one grows and they are putting up new buildings there all the time as well

(ET) it is Kenneth Ave

(KB) that one has grown substantially in the last 5 years,

(SB) you would think that we got tapping fees for all that!

(KB) That entire apartment complex is less than ten years old,

(FM) there were tapping fees paid on that, there was a whole issue with that project to begin with as to how they were going to run the water, and phase it, and the where the lines go here or there. It was a little goofy to tell you the truth.

(ET) The fees were based on?

(FM) the number of units

(SB) generally the way the EDUs work is there is some kind of established engineering practices and that is how you determine an EDU based upon the number of rooms or based on? Basically if you are building a restaurant and depending upon the number of seats and the bathrooms and what type of restaurant it is determines the number of EDUs if you are doing an office building than based upon the square footage.

(KB) right and with the salon, how many chairs are in the salon?

(ET) in an apartment complex you have a building and you say that there is going to be 6 apartments there, you charge 6 EDUs right? Because each unit represents a family.

(FM) one of the things, Kerri brings up a good point, these older complexes like College Park and Roxbury Ridge, and I am not sure how old Bard Meadows would be relative to this but, there were never EDUs assigned to those because that wasn't something the authority dealt in back before 1988, they just did not deal with EDUs. If you were outside the borough limit of the Borough of Shippensburg, there was a tariff that was in place, that was put in place by the PUC and it did not allow for EDUs it did not allow for tapping fees or connection fees. In other words you can live on one side of one street in Shippensburg that was in the Borough and somebody lives across the

street and you want water and he does too, they come and dig it up and they send you because you live in the borough a bill for connecting to the water system and the guy across the street got it for nothing. So, going back, my point is, going back it's not like there would be something in the records that says there were 743 EDUs that were assigned to Roxbury Ridge.

(SB) I think it is worth looking at these bylaws whether it is just this particular part of the bylaws or the bylaw as a whole, because we spent in the last years, before some of us were here and on other boards and everything. Working with some entities and arguing from a point of we have to make sure everything is equitable and we have to make sure we are proper stewards of the rate payers and using that as the argument when we went to Schreiber and CVRDC and said that you need to pony up. As so if that is going to be our goal as a board is to be stewards across the board and make sure as a rate payer that you are paying your fair rate and everybody else is paying their fair rate based on the best of our ability to do, then it really is worth us looking into this to make sure that moving forward. Yes, we can't go back and charge somebody 20 years ago that should have been charged, we are not going to do that. But if moving forward two years from now, somebody does something, that if they were a new developer they would charged but since they are already a current user they aren't getting charged. We need to make sure our bylaws reflect that and give us the ability to be able to do that.

(KB) There is nothing wrong specifically with the climate that was Shippensburg for so many years. I know when I was on Borough Council we went through leases, all of our leases and all of our agreements and all of our contracts, one by one, by one as everyone on this board except Angelo is well aware so of those contracts came back to less than amicable means. So I don't necessarily think that it is a horribly bad idea for us to revisit it because of everything is so antiquated and things were done piece mail. I know on Borough Council I spent a good two years from looking at, who we got to change the oil on the Borough vehicles to the contract we have with the water authority. I mean just that large of a spectrum. There is nothing wrong with us revisiting all of this. We should it probably has not been looked at if ever.

(MP) Okay but we enter into this conversation at looking at our bylaws, as a means of trying to resolve the issue with this Indian Springs Trailer Park.

(KB) kind of, but I think it goes further reaching than that.

(MP) Clearly it does, but I am trying to bring the conversation back to SCWA, and trying to go forward and how we go forward properly with SCWA.

(ET) Forest can we make that part of the agreement? Signed by them, going forward, any expansion of that trailer park will result in a charge for whatever we are going to call it.

(FM) tapping fee

(MP) If I understand it correctly they paid for 39 connections, so anything beyond 39 connections they are going to have to come and seek approval, would that be a correct understanding? So they have 4 empty lots, they fill those 4, beyond that they are going to have to come for approval for anymore. When they come for that approval that is when we can levy the EDU charge on them.

(SB) And we need to make sure at other times we have documented it now and we don't go back off course, that at another time we look at our bylaws and make sure what we do with our bylaws as a whole, matches up with what we did to them.

(MP) that is consistent across all of our regulations

(KB) We need to look at our bulk users too, like Mike said.

(MP) does that make sense?

(ET) Forest, can we do that?

(DH) you need to address the issue of the meter reading as a part of your agreement with SCWA too, that is an issue, you are not obligated to do that, if you include that in your agreement with

SCWA to take over the system, that this will change then maybe get by that business of having to live with their bylaws and their agreements for that purpose.

(MP) What are you talking about? We are going to read that one meter in that trailer park, we are not going to read each individual meter.

(DH) You need to include that in your agreement to take over. Maybe you can overcome that administrative problem.

(TP) the other solution would be to put the meters on every lot down there

(ET) the reader

(TP) the extra one, read the master meter, gets billed to Mongold or whatever

(FM) velocity

(TP) the rest of them gets billed to the residents, we just got to buy new meters and that will take care of the EDUs

(KB) But that was my issue, my issue with that was, is that we are doing some adding and some subtracting then, because the master meter is going to read everything that is going into that Park, so we would have to take 39 readings add those together and subtract that from the master read. And the difference is what would go to the trailer park. That seems to me like that would be an administrative burden.

(SB) A couple of minutes on an excel spreadsheet.

(TP) they used to do that my way because there was a 2" line and if it leaked that is what they billed, we all split that. It never happened but they used to do it.

(MP) so let's just review that so we are saying that, there is 39 connections out there, there is going to be a total of 40 meters, 39 are going to be attached to each lot, and there is going to be the one meter, which is the master meter for the whole unit. You are saying reading all of the meters, total all the meters from the individual users and compare that with the master and then what, who pays what?

(TP) if the master meter denotes more readings than the total of the lots that gets billed to Velocity.

(FM) that is the way the agreement is

(MP) So we would be sending a bill to each individual lot renter on their meter, what their meter says

(TP) And what that is going to help out in the future, is when they bring that 45th trailer in, we get that tapping fee and we put that meter in, we know because they need our meter to put in for future lots.

(KB) But then that puts us at this inferior quality infrastructure that they used to run these water lines, is then our responsibility.

(TP) no

(SB) Because it is behind the meter,

(TP) the owner is paying for it

(SB) so the meter at the beginning of the system, so basically that meter is checking the amount of water that is being leaked in between each customer

(MP) Because if it leaks the trailer park owner pays it

(TP) that is going to force him to pay that

(ET) This is another idea, can we bill him, because he is now paying for all the water, as a service can we bill him for all the water and tell him that lot number this and lot number that, this is how much they used and you can bill them for that. And do the paperwork for him but still get one check for him because.

(SB) I mean that could be a conversation we have with them during this process, I think at some point we need to talk to Velocity while we are doing this.

(ET) They have deeper pockets, I am thinking of people not paying their water bill.

(TP) They are only not going to pay it, for one quarter and then we will shut them off

(KB) Why are we making this more administratively burdensome then we need to, it is not like this trailer park, this trailer park owner sounds like he has been a real pleasure to work with, with the SCWA, I am not sure why we are going to bend over backwards to help a guy out.

(ET) Because he doesn't know how much water he has been getting for free and dumping it into the ground.

(KB) well he is going to be finding that out real quickly

(TP) and in the future is he adds more there, we won't have any idea unless we are putting our meters in.

(KB) that issue is separate than giving him a spread sheet saying lot 1 is using this much water, lot 7 is using this much water

(ET) Then just don't put the readers in on the other meters and just bill them for the one. But he needs to know that he is going to pay for each additional lot 40 and above.

(KB) We would have to, because he is only approved for 39

(DH) The only problem is how do you know when they add that, there is nothing to trigger it that is where Troy is going he is saying if they have to come and get a meter than you will know and then they will have to pay the connection charge

(FM) There is no system beyond the 39 units.

(DH) No distribution system?

(FM) There is no distribution system beyond the 39 units so

(SB) But currently our bylaws, we have established it currently, if all of a sudden, SME wants to buy some neighboring land and expand the trailer park there and put lines in, to put water in the new trailer lots, there is nothing we can do about it.

(DH) if it is behind the meter

(SB) they don't have pipe there now and then all of the sudden decide they want to add pipe to add the other 100 and some they have been approved for by the township. What can we do about it?

(KB) they have approval for 39 with SCWA is that right? So there is an agreement for 39 and then that's it. If they want 40 then that is either an amendment to the agreement or another agreement.

(SB) Right, and that is when everybody everything the way they are supposed to do everything.

(KB) which we all know in Shippensburg

(SB) does not happen especially in the township we are dealing with, where you basically have approval for 39 waters and you got approval for 190 lots.

(DH) it may be that you put something in an agreement with the mobile home park that you do a yearly audit of how many units are there and you adjust, if it is more than 39 than you have to pay.

(KB) the way that Troy laid it out, okay, if the administrative burden is not massive and it really only a matter of moments that is different than what I am saying, we are sending out 40 more bills, so actually the borough is sending out 40 more bills there are 39 more bills than there typically would. What are we doing now? Are we sending out bills to those 39 users or are we sending one massive bill to velocity? Like we don't even know how it is being handled right now.

(FM) I believe SCWA sends each individual lot a bill, because there agreement is that they read the meter, they read the individual meters right now

(MP) So Troy's idea, I like Troy's idea it makes sense. Read the meters that are there, read the new meter, the master meter and then subtract it and then whatever is being lost is being paid for by the owner, and they can only go to 39 lots. Lot #40 they would have to get approval for an EDU for a tapping fee. And then we go forward from there, I think that is the easiest thing, it doesn't require them to have to agree to anything, right, it is just sort of following along with what is happening, right

I think that makes a lot of sense. I think that is the solution, would you write that into what becomes a part of our final agreement?

(FM) Assuming you decide that you are going to go forward, we can put it into the agreement.

(MP) So let's jump back, I think there is another thing we have to look at. It said in here we are to be sending, monthly the authority shall provide SCWA a statement with supporting invoices of the amounts drawn from this escrow account. So I have a couple of questions, number 1 have we drawn from this escrow account to date, John do you know?

(JE) I think we have

(MP) Do you know? Have we sent them a statement as this is described in item 3?

(JE) I will follow up with on that, because I don't have an answer for you tonight.

(ET) but we didn't sign this agreement yet

(JE) But we do have an escrow

(MP) Wait this agreement was signed, wasn't it

(KB) This is just us saying okay we will talk to you

(MP) these are the parameters and this is the way we will go forward.

(SB) this came out of, we were just dragging our feet

(KB) And then they were dragging their feet

(SB) and then they were dragging their feet and we were like if we are going to do this, we need \$25,000 to investigate it. So out of that came 4 pages

(MP) So then Forest then what is the next step and is there something that we are missing? What else due diligence item should we be engaged with that we haven't so far engaged relative to this merger.

(FM) I am not sure there are any other than the engineering and the finances of it.

(MP) So the finances you are going to get together with Mr. Goodhart and work that out and see what that would look like. Would you be able to provide a statement that would be the paragraph that is going to describe all that we talked about in the past hour and ten minutes about business about reading individual meters so that it is clearly understood, SCWA clearly understands and the trailer park owner clearly understands before this goes through, because if they are going to have an objection and they don't want to do it, then we need to know that upfront.

(SB) Should we have another face to face meeting, like an invite from that they invite authority members or association members? Should we have another informational session like here is where we are.

(MP) We can, but all you get is Mr. Fink, didn't you and I sit with Mr. Fink one day, I couldn't remember.

(SB) That was pre-me

(KB) it was pre-you vice chair

(FM) are you talking about a meeting with "the membership"

(SB) Actually having an informational meeting with the association members

(MP) no body shows up

(PM) Can I bring up one topic? Because you are talking about the things that you need to investigate, this is just for your consideration. You do know there are 4" inch lines, PVC lines there; 4" inch lines do not support fire suppression. So the system that you are buying will not provide adequate fire protection to those customers, the system that you are assuming. I just want to make sure that you realize that when you assume this, then you assume that.

(KB) So what you are telling us is if a house catches on fire in Lees Cross Roads, we are screwed?

(SB) they take the tanker out,

(KB) does Walnut Bottom have a tanker? Because that is who responds

(SB) they have a tanker and they take it down to probably by Lane and get water out of Lane. So right now we are probably giving them water now, they are taking the tanker up to the hydrant by Lane. There is a hydrant up there in between little tykes and lane.

(MP) so help me understand is there a legal responsibility if we take this over to replace these 4" inch lines to lines that will provide fire suppression?

(PM) I don't know

(FM) I don't believe that you do have a legal responsibility

(KB) does it affect any type of insurance

(SB) the question is, if this is part of our system, not we are taking this system over and running it as a water board. Does this impact the rest of our system with the work that we have been trying to do to get our fire rates up?

(FM) I am not following what you mean

(SB) What I am saying is we have been trying to make sure, we are properly maintaining our fire hydrants we have been adding maintenance we have been making sure we just passed a line that added significant fire protection to a significant portion of our system and now we are going to bring another part of this system on line that lacks adequate fire, does that impact across the board? Like say we are looking at fire ratings for Cumberland and we bring that on board does that impact all the rate payers in Southampton Cumberland or is that based on...

(FM) it seems to me if you take this over, you are going to create a separate district so that everything would almost be a separate entity, that certain aspects would be integrated to the authorities system.

(SB) that is what I am saying are we continuing to run it the way that they are running it now, but better, that basically we are running their system as their system and they are paying us and our staff is running that system and the inner connect is there, but on an average day the interact is not actually pushing any water through.

(MP) So let me follow up on that, are there hydrants out there?

(FM) no

(MP) No hydrants at all?

(DH) There are actually some hydrants in the trailer park, because some of the lines in the trailer park, I was told are 6" and that is why they actually asked to put a 6" meter in even though it was being fed from a 4" line. This is one of the reasons why I questioned why are we putting a 6" meter in when it is being fed by a 4" line. In any case, there are 3 fire hydrants in the trailer park.

(MP) so the fire companies know if they go out there they are taking a tanker, as Steve was saying

(ET) insurance companies know too

(KB) Walnut Bottom would be who would respond to that, it would not be the Shippensburg Fire Companies

(FM) We do have fire hydrants along

(KB) I am trying to picture if we do or not

(SB) Well they are in between Lane and Little Tykes

(KB) There is a hydrant there but

(SB) you got one at the corner of High Rd and Strohm too, there are actually 3 or 4 hydrants in between Strohm Rd and

(KB) but they do no good?

(SB) our system goes out to Lane and Little Tykes

(KB) So we have 6" lines out there

(FM) 12"

(SB) We got a 12" the whole way out High Rd, and then you got a 10" line that goes into Little Tykes.

(MP) So it possible to fight a fire out there, fire flows off of those hydrants

(FM) I think Peggy's point is, is something long term, I don't think it is a major issue right now, but your point is well taken.

(PM) it is a lot of money for 163 connections

(MP) I appreciate you bringing that up, any other jams that we should flush out?

(PM) Just my concern, I did read it appears that they have other than the trailer park, leaky system because the amount of water they produce verses the amount of water they bill. I read in here there is a pretty big discrepancy there and when you have 163 connections that number should be pretty tight.

(KB) how big is the discrepancy

(PM) it just said in one of the comments, did not give a number, I think it said excessive

(KB) Can we find that, that should be easy to find out, how much water they produce verses how much water they bill.

(TP) there is a meter in the pump thing there is a meter in the pump

(KB) that should be relatively fast and easy to find out, can we request that they give us that information for the last 6 months or they do quarterly billing, for the last 3 quarters?

(MP) So John, make that note and can you make that request of them?

(JE) yes

(MP) I think we would want to look at that if they have a big water loss problem then that is another item to put on the list of reasons why we don't want to do this.

(KB) We got to remember though guys, we talked about this the last meeting, and this isn't a choice. This is a now or it gets handed to us.

(MP) okay Peggy said before you came in, another great point by Peggy, she said look if that is what happens and you get forced to take it, you can always push back and say okay we will take it but where is the money to make this system right? Because or rate payers can't be paying for all of these problems.

(ET) that is my question, two and a half million dollar upgrade

(MP) for a 167 homes

(ET) they couldn't afford that

(KB) We can't afford that and we have how many users 6,300 something like that?

(MP) that is a big expense

(KB) That is pretty much our entire Possum Hollow budget

(ET) that is exactly what it is

(MP) okay any other challenges to this possible merger? That is quite enough isn't it? Okay so what happens next, if you would please John do your piece that we brought out this evening. And Forest if you will do yours and let's make a report at the next regular meeting. And hopefully we can go forward with regular meetings and not have to have another sit down on this one. Anybody else have anything they want to say or add to this conversation concerning SCWA potential merger?

(ET) is there a way to limit the liability of a current Shippensburg rate payer by making this an entity of its own? Kind of like a subsidiary of ours?

(SB) We could basically do the same thing with them that we do with the Borough that basically we are managing it and we are paying the borough to manage it on a day to day operation. We are the oversight.

(ET) Would that limit our exposure a little if it was an entity of its own? And we just had an agreement with them

(FM) the liability would be with the entity, not the overall system, but I am not sure what liability there really is in this kind of thing unless you have some kind of major malfunction, like the chlorine doesn't work or something.

(MP) Are you saying that, rather than merge with them, you are saying let them stand as their own entity but they could pay us to run it for them, is that what you are suggesting? Or am I taking it too far?

(ET) I was taking it a step further; I was thinking that is a good point the way you put it. But I was thinking maybe a subsidiary of us, but we would have a contract between us and them to handle the management.

(SB) legally I think we could because once an authority is formed an authority can do any type of quasi government business in the state

(KB) but why would we? What would be the benefit?

(SB) that is what I am asking, if it is going to increase liability to the rest of the rate payers, and the rest of the rate payers in the SBA does it make sense? At one point didn't we do some kind of loan for a project up in the middle of the state or something?

(FM) Bethlehem School District, remember we borrowed \$25 million dollars

(ET) I am the new guy on the block and the only reason why I suggested it because I heard some comments made about the other take over from Huckleberry land and some things crept up, you know and I don't know how it was handled, because that was before my time. I am just trying to think of a way to at least shelter us a little bit.

(FM) well that system was not going to make it literally, when they came to the authority, basically to have the authority take them over. Their representation to the authority was that we have about a month to go.

(KB) We have this much money in the bank, and next month we won't have any.

(FM) Obviously they had already talked to DEP about it because they knew enough to say, you will probably have to come and take us over and the one mistake the authority made in that case was, and it could be said with this one too is about two years before they came and wanted to be take over. They had come and wanted to buy water from the authority and the authority agreed to allow them to run a line from High Rd at the intersection of High and South Mountain Rd. From up South Mountain Rd to their system and made an interconnect to their system at the property line where the development started that is where the interconnect is, I think. So at that point their comments were you are already providing us with water, so if you don't want to take us over you will end up having to take us over anyways. Because if we are going to fail, Mr. Ginnich and Mr. Nichols were the two people that were the principals and they came and they sat and they said, if you don't take us over we are going to be bankrupt anyways and you will have to take us over.

(SB) Back to Angelo's point is there, is the direction we are going the only direction to try and proceed? Do we go with are we going to take the system, we are going to make sure we protect our current rate payers financially and that we make sure that we set this up for as high level of success as possible in our system? Or does it make sense to find some other way to do it, where we are just like the borough provides staff to us to run our system. Where maybe we are running their system but it is still their system.

(MP) so who is the they? Mr. Fink resigns there is nobody left that is the problem out there.

(JE) they don't want it anymore.

(ET) I was going to somehow we acquire it, but I think we have to do it before something happens, keep it a separate entity.

(SB) We own the sewer treatment plant but we don't mix the sewer treatment money with

(JE) It sounds complicated

(ET) it does sound complicated

(FM) if you are okay with me doing this, I will do some research and figure out if there is a way to do what Steve wants, I understand what He is saying , I understand what you are saying. You want to take it over but you don't want to take it over. I will try to put together a report for your next meeting that addresses that.

(MP) I think it would be interesting to know if there is another way to go at this other than a full merger. If you can help them out but keep them their own entity with their own issues and their own problems, then our rate payers should never then be exposed to the liabilities out there.

(KB) And we also know that it is self-sufficient, it is just that there is nobody left to run it.

(MP) yes, there is nobody left to run it, it is paying its debt now they really just need somebody to operate it. If there is another way, I think we should listen to another way.

(FM) Maybe another way is to find some private company like PA Water to buy them.

(PM) Not to add length to this but maybe there is a reason why PA American is not looking into this,

(FM) well there is only 163 customers

(MP) it is too small

(FM) there is 59 lots approved in that Castle Wood where the old school was on Kline Rd. So that is 60 potential new customers which is almost a 1/3 of their current customer base.

b. Consideration to Pursue Grants through the PA Small Water & Sewer Program (Submittal Deadline is October 31st, 2016)

***Southern Cumberland Water Association**

(FM) I think it is too ambitious to try and get something together for Oct 31st but I think it is important to meet with Mr. Alloway for the purpose of letting him know that we are interested in other possible grants because this isn't the only grant program and I am sure it is not going to be the last one. Depending on what happens on Nov 8th there might be a lot more money maybe that will solve your problem with SCWA on this new stimulus package if it gets passed.

(MP) so you are saying you don't think it's possible to pull this grant together by Oct 31 for PA Small Water, and that we will go talk to Alloway for any other grants that come up in the future.

(FM) Yes, to put him on notice that we are going to be looking for grants, and we will be approaching him to support the SBAs applications.

(MP) any discussion? None

***Lurgan Booster Pump Station**

c. Discussion/Consideration to Relocate Study Area for Proposed Well #4

(MP) Let's recap. We were at Aleman's properties some years ago and our negotiations with them to purchase the rights to go on the property and eventually purchase the property if we should happen to have a successful test well, really came unraveled. As it was coming unraveled it was pointed out that a few hundred yards away was a Well on the Valley Quarries property that was producing, we thought at that time, copious amounts of water so we changed our direction and we made arrangements with Valley Quarries to get rights to work that land and put a test Well in and you all know the story, and what we have there now is a hole in the ground that is not really usable to us. We are sort of at a start all over again. So this subject matter of where to locate a Well has been studied in the borough and the SBA certainly 20 years, probably 40 years. So there is not a whole lot new there, we do have two questions. 1 is the Tomstown layer South of where we have looked is that possible? Steve has pointed out a triangular area near Thompson Creek that may be there, and so Mr. O' Donnel is in the process

(DH) he is in the process he has not finished that review yet, he has had a couple of things come up, since our meeting a week and a half ago, which has not allowed him to do that.

(MP) okay so we will get some more input about that, so far it appears that our best bet is the original site at the Alleman Property. So we have had that discussion in executive session last time, so the question to us now is what do we do to go forward with Well # 4? Do you want to drill again in the existing area that we just had a failed test in? Failed because of the shaft turned out to be inoperable, not that we didn't get any water at all or do we want to move, since we are going to have to move anyway. Do we want to try and move and go back to the Alleman Property which according to Mr. O' Donnel there is a greater probability that you would have greater water when you drill that test Well. That is kind of the question that we have. So I have some questions about it, if we were to, is it possible to leave both doors open? And for how long can you leave the Valley Quarries property open to us accessible to us through the contract that you have with them to purchase the property?

(FM) I think that you can extend it again, the agreement, we have an option agreement. I think we would have the ability to extend that option agreement, but we would have to pay another \$2500.00 for it

(SB) Also the benefit was that we could use that busted Well as a test Well, if we do ever drill on the Alleman property.

(MP) So what are the questions that you all have about proceeding?

(TP) I guess for me, is the cost difference, we already sort of have agreements for the Valley Quarry property and we all know how that went prior with the Alleman's as well. That is the thing there that sticks in my mind, what are we going to get in with purchasing, right of way, Well Head are and all that. As compared to just staying with Valley Quarries and take a chance, we know there is water there we don't know how much, half a million a day was estimated.

(DH) that was what the blown yield was, we won't really know until we do a test.

(MP) I was told, and correct me if I am wrong, I remember the likelihood of it being more was very small; the likelihood of it being less was greater, correct?

(DH) if we stayed on the Quarry Property? I don't know if anybody can say that.

(MP) let me rephrase that

(DH) The chances of it being a lot more maybe minimal, there is a chance that it could be less.

(MP) Here is what I am trying to say, if they had been able to do the next test on the shaft, the likelihood of that test yielding greater than 500,000 was minimal, whereas the likelihood of that test showing less than 500,000 was greater

(DH) I think that is generally accurate

(MP) That is all I am saying, I know if you popped another hole in the ground

(DH) there is always a possibility when you do the full Well, you made the hole larger you could get slightly larger capacity but you don't know that, until you do the test you just don't know that.

(ET) How long do we have an agreement with Valley Quarries for that area?

(FM) Actually it is coming up, it's due now, and again we have the ability as the authority to extend it by paying them \$2500 for another year.

(MP) so what would the cost be, before you actually go and start talking to Allemans about what would be possible, so what cost would be incurred to get that far? So to set it up, are there costs before you actually go and talk to them?

(FM) not really, I just go and talk to them and say hey I'm back!

(MP) so there is no costs upfront for us to go and knock on the door and find out where we are at.

(FM) maybe they have changed their mind

(MP) or whatever, I am not sure

(FM) Well we talked, and to be honest and fair to them, they were very cooperative, until they associated Mr. Weigle and then it was all of a sudden we want so much money and we want royalties for the water, so much per gallon and again. You heard me, you were on the authority and I don't know who else was at the time but my comment back to them was I never heard of this for a public water system but there is always a first time.

Show me where it is being done, obviously you can make any kind of agreement that you want but show me where it is being done. And Mr. Weigle represented to me that he knew places where it was being done, but to this day I haven't seen anything.

(MP) so there is no cost to set it up, so what we would need to do is have an executive session where we talk about the strategy that we want to employ in this new round of negotiations, that would be the next step, the next physical actual step that we would take. What do you all think?

(ET) My question is would we need the ability to go on their land and dig a test Well?

(FM) yes, we had an agreement with them, a license agreement before, we paid them, I am not sure how much, I would have to get the file and look, but usually to do something like that, we usually paid them something like a \$1,000.00 and that we would put back the property the way it is. Now we never got to the point where we got a license agreement like we have with Valley Quarries that says we can move a drilling rig in there and drill a Well.

(SB) because we didn't negotiated terms

(FM) right because we never got far enough along in the option process, one of the other issues that will come up and it came up before is we have to get a road in there. There is no way in, to come from Sandbank Rd we would have to get a right of way across Valley Quarries and then we would have to develop, there is a little old logging trail that we would have to develop which means cutting trees and grading and all that.

(KB) Just to get a test Well?

(FM) Just to get a drilling rig in there to do a test Well, yes.

(MP) and the cost to produce this,

(DH) I am not sure if anybody has actually looked at the cost

(FM) you are looking at what? I don't have a scale. This is the Allemans over here and this is Sandbank Rd so you have to get a road from here to here.

(MP) that is a long way isn't it?

(FM) Probably a 1/4 to 1/3 of a mile

(MP) this can be a dirt road it doesn't have to be paved in the end?

(FM) you don't have to pave it

(SB) You need to cut the trees and then you need to pull the stumps and then you need to put gravel down, you need to make a mountain road basically.

(MP) what do you think that costs?

(JE) Slate is inexpensive, just the cost to haul it in, but slate will disappear into mud

(KB) It also pops tires

(JE) right but you would two A over top of that

(SB) We have the equipment and the staff to be able to do that

(JE) I mean a temporary to get in and out to test, we could probably handle that

(FM) I mean one of the discussions that I had with the Alleman's before was, if you cut all these trees down, I want the wood, but if it is any good wood I want compensated for it. So if you cut a tree down like that, you can't make lumber out of it. If you cut a tree down like maybe it has value for lumber.

(KB) but they are saying we want the wood and if the wood is good wood we want compensation for the wood that you are giving us anyway?

(SB) We are talking about keeping our agreement with Valley Quarry and we are going to take the road in that way.

(FM) look you still got to go in, this is Alleman, this is their property line, and you would be going through their woods.

(SB) ok

(MP) so you build this road in there and let's say we get another bust and we drill this Well and for what reason it isn't going to work. Do we have to put those trees back?

(FM) no

(MP) What do we do? Do we compensate them, how do you unravel this thing afterwards?

(FM) Well we wouldn't compensate them after the fact we would have an agreement about compensating them before the fact. So maybe we pay them new enterprise stone and lime are generous and they only wanted 2500 hours to get a license, we might have to pay them \$5,000 or \$10,000 but that includes the trees, that includes our ability to build the road.

(KB) How much wood are we talking about? I paid somebody to cut trees down a couple of years ago and two trees was \$750.

(FM) these aren't huge trees

(KB) mine weren't either

(FM) But they are trees that are 6 inches in diameter, so you have to cut; you have to cut a road as wide as this room probably.

(DH) hopefully it is bull dozing and pushing little trees over rather than being careful about whether a tree falls on your house or not.

(FM) Well, I don't think you can tell Mr. Alleman that, you are not going to go in there with a bulldozer and push a road in, you could, but you are not going to, he won't let you. You are going to clear the trees down, and then push a road in. I know him well enough to know that.

(SB) you are saying part of our negotiation is if we are doing this and we are putting a road in, we are going to get an agreement with him to put a road in and the road is going to be this thick, part of that agreement would be that we define, here is where we are going to put the road, you go and get somebody that wants to take your lumber, and you can make your money off your lumber. Once that is done, then we will put the road in.

(FM) That is a possibility yes,

(SB) so he gets his money for lumber

(KB) but there isn't going to be any value in 6" lumber except for firewood and it is going to be somebody that is going to come in and say I will cut your trees down, but I get to take the wood. That is not going to be any value for him.

(SB) My thought is to put options on the table so that whenever there is an objection that we are able to

(KB) How long is this road?

(FM) what did you figure Dennis?

(DH) right now, the larger radius is 400 feet, so I am thinking 1500 feet.

(SB) how long is the quarries property?

(DH) that includes the quarry property

(SB) how much is the quarries property from the road to the line?

(DH) more than half of it

(FM) But that also is trees,

(MP) still got to cut the trees and put a road in

(FM) these are just issues, not impediments

(JE) but if he is not going to be cooperative than this is all...

(MP) all for nothing

(ET) Forest, can we go to Valley and extend the agreement that we have and because eventually if we would go the other way we would have to get an agreement from Valley also right? Can we include that little piece? And where I am going with this is maybe at this point in time we make sure we have the option to get to the Alleman property included in this and then we need water right? We know that this is going to give us water, right next to the hole we dug, at the Valley Property.

(MP) At the Valley we don't know that, I mean it is always a gamble, you drill a new Well

(KB) There is a likely chance that there will be water there but we have no idea how much.

(MP) there is two data points that says that there is water there

(SB) But is there water there to support a long term municipal Well? Basically that is what the next test we would of have to do if the shaft wouldn't have gotten out of align is that we would have done a full blown test to see if it would actually support a long term municipal Well.

(ET) We would have to do the same thing on the Alleman property.

(TP) how far do we have to put infrastructure in

(JE) 1500 feet

(FM) to get it to the road and then you still have Sandbank Road

(TP) to get to our pipe

(SB) I think that a lot of this is that we want to, just like we are trying to do with everything else in this system we want to try to proceed with multiple options, so that we have multiple ways to go about getting this last Well.

(KB) I think what Angelo said was a perfect solution; we need to rework the contract with Valley Quarries to include that section of the wooded area. We need a new water source regardless of how close our water line is we need a water source. I talked to Peggy she is saying Well 3 is still belly up, essentially so at this point we are in critical need of a new water source.

(DH) 9500 feet to Sandbank to Strohm to High or 7200 from Chestnut Grove to Strohm to High, so that is the number.

(TP) So a mile or a mile and a quarter of line even after we get the Well

(DH) right

(SB) but we are looking at 30 million dollars to rebuild a water treatment plant on the other side of the Valley.

(MP) let me ask you this Mr. Myers we have not advertised an executive session is it permissible for us to enter into an executive session, even though it hasn't been advertised?

(FM) I am not sure, why, what difference would it make?

(SB) it is not on the agenda

(FM) we can have an executive session, yes

(JE) about action?

(MP) about negotiation strategy, contractual matters

(FM) it is an advertised meeting just because you didn't say you are going to have an executive session, doesn't mean that you can't have it

(KB) We can add things to the agenda, just as the Chairman stated, I would like to add as agenda item 3. Or Executive Session, he can do that as Chairman.

(MP) We are going to add an Executive Session and we will enter that now, the time is 8:47pm Adjourned
Returned at 9:04pm

(MP) During executive session we discussed a contractual matter and we have given instruction to Mr. Myers to open a negotiation concerning some property.

5. Any Other Business

(PM) I have one item and possibly a second item. The first item I would like to bring up is we have been doing fire hydrant flushing, and we have been doing that during the day. And when you flush during the day that creates a tremendous draw through the line that is exactly what it is intended to do. But it has created quite a bit of concern by people who are home during the day, when they go to turn their tap on they are seeing discolored water, and debris, etc. etc. We have put notices on the website about this, in talking with the guys doing this; they said historically when they have done it years ago in the past. They did it at night, so when people got up everything was done, and that great big flush was taken and they may have just a little bit of discoloration but it is cleared up in the morning and they asked if they could go back to doing it at night. We had some concern initially with that due to the timing of it, with all the information that people have been getting public notifications that people may be very concerned about during this at night. I don't know if I have that same concern, we have really pelted the media with information as to what is going on. John has put it in the paper that we are doing hydrant flushing; it is on the website.

(KB) I have gotten 2 or 3 alerts on my phone

(FM) I have nixle

(SB) I got facebook

(PM) So what are the thoughts about going back to do it at night verses the day?

(KB) That is a management decision

(MP) John that is up to you, want to schedule your folks and if you think it is safe, it is your choice

(JE) I understand that the guys want to do it that way, my only concern is and it just may be a concern that right now, we are not in the brightest light with the public with our water. I think that in my opinion if I saw the water department out in the middle of the night, flushing lines, the first thing I would say on facebook, is there are at it again.

(SB) I think there are some people that are going to say that, but I think we are never going to please 100% of the population

(JE) I understand that and if Peggy and the guys feel, it is the best time to do it, then I support it

(KB) I think you are going to get less flashback from somebody driving by somebody who is flushing lines at 11:30 to 12:00 at night, then you are from the 4,000 people or 400 people that might be at home that are turning on their faucet water and seeing dirty water.

(PM) I actually talked to Darryl about, because he is one of the main guys doing it, and he said, and this didn't even occur to me until now, is he is out flushing and then he gets called to do something else. There is a problem somewhere so he has to stop flushing and go check a leak or do something else and then he goes back to flushing, so now it is taking longer. Whereas if you were doing something at night, you wouldn't be getting called out.

(JE) I have no problem with that if Peggy and guys think that's the best way

(KB) I think that is a management decision

(MP) Put a notice up, you know on the website or wherever you put it and say that we will be flushing at night and give the reason why, I think then you are okay.

(PM) We would be doing this at night to be the least disruptive.

(SB) I have one question and I just want to make sure we asked this question. The contract that we currently have with the borough employees, do they get time and half for working in the evenings?

(ET) time and a half would be overtime

(SB) There are certain parts of our contract, like weekends is time and a half.

(KB) Quite frankly it is our issue, so it is not like it is the Boroughs issue,

(SB) I am just asking due diligence if we are going to be expecting on our next invoice to pay time and a half for these hours as opposed to paying regular pay. Just so we asked the question, I am not going to put a kibosh on it, because if Peggy really thinks that it is the right thing to do then that is what we do. I just want to ask the question, what are we paying.

(JE) Unless the guys are willing to start at a later time

(MP) Do they have to be willing or can you make their schedules such?

(ET) Union

(JE) with the union you have to be careful, Lance has done it with his guys

(KB) but if we are pulling the guys off of their normal duties, I mean obviously if Darryl is the one flushing the lines and he is getting called off to go do this and this and this and this, then he is needed. It appears to that this would be best used as an overtime situation.

(JE) we got to do it either way

(PM) can we talk to Mark and find out how Lance did it as well and handle it the best way there is

(SB) I want you to do what you think the best way to do it is that I just wanted to ask the question because I want to know if on the next invoice we are going to see a whole bunch of time and a half. So we know ahead of time.

(MP) Like with anything else please do it in a way that is most cost effective, that is really what is being asked.

(PM) John received this today and brought it to my attention it is a letter from DEP. What they are really asking, I personally don't think it is that bad of a letter in light of all the letters that you have received. What they are asking for is the pre enforcement conference to give us the opportunity to discuss as they say our situation with DEP, before they take any enforcement actions. This is specific to the violations that you have received August 4th and August 5th, she goes on in her letter to say what the specific problems were. I do think this a good thing, DEP could have not done this and you could of simply gotten a letter in the mail that assessed a civil penalty and any other enforcement actions that they wanted to take against you. However, they are giving us the opportunity to come before them and say, yes we had a problem, we don't know why we had the problem, but we had the problem. Here is what we have done since that time and go through each one of the items that DEP lists here for example the first one they have is the LT2 plan we know it was submitted late. Here is the follow up action that was taken, I have emails, and one of the first things I jumped on was the LT2 plan. Here was the conversations back and forth and here is the copy and it is undertaken and actually where it is in now in our sampling program. We haven't gotten any laboratory results back but just itemize, have packets prepared for them say here is what we have done to address the situation and I would imagine DEP would say exactly like you did, Michael. The very first meeting what are you doing to prevent this from happening in the future so we would need to have something to present to DEP to say not only have we resolved this issue, but here is what we are doing to ensure it doesn't happen again in the future. Hopefully they will be receptive to that and not enforce any monetary fines, or any other actions but it is DEP and I have no idea. They do say that you can take your attorney with you if you want, but you have to notify them. So the meeting is coming up it is the same day as the next regular meeting.

(FM) It is the day after

(JE) It is November 9th. I did talk to Michael briefly before the meeting started. Michael is available to attend, so at this time, I thought it would be, you and I and Michael and possibly Dennis. I don't think we want to go down with our attorney because we are going to seem like we are ready to fight. If legal action is required after the fact then we will deal with it, but I think we ought to go down with our hats in our hand and a nice little booklet. Here is what we have done; we have had issues we have taken tremendous steps to ensure this doesn't happen again.

(FM) that is a good point

(JE) I think we will do more bees with honey than with vinegar. I think we will do okay that way, I don't know what is your schedule, Peggy is already aware of it, Michael is okay to go, if the board is okay with it, it will be us 4 representing SBA and the Borough at this meeting.

(SB) that is fine

(JE) So Peggy and I will be working on a response, getting some packets together and perhaps we can do a conference call or get together if we have to.

(ET) We are getting together the night before

(JE) that is right, we can get together the night before everything, we can put that in the midnight to 1am!

(ET) just remember what night that is

(PM) I would like to call her and find out who is going to be there on their behalf and find out what they are going to be presenting so I will have a little background.

(FM) You might not even have to leave, you can just go straight from here to there, and it's at 9:30 in the morning.

(JE) first I was kind of shocked at the letter, but then I talked to Peggy and what she said is it is a golden opportunity for us to ease the impact, and now I fully agree with that now that I think about it.

(MP) I would like to interpret the letter as they are opening the door to hear from us, as to what we have done since the bad stuff happened.

(JE) I think they know that we have done major steps to do corrective action.

(MP) I think we can work this very well

(FM) I have one item that involves Peggy and Dennis and it involves the Bender property. Troy did a great job going out and talking to them, since then I was able to get a copy of the plans that were submitted. They were never recorded; they were approved by the township but never gotten recorded, which located some potential sites for this. Here is my concern, apparently what happen on this location is when Wingert's Feed was being built, they had extra fill, this Troy's comments, they had extra fill that they needed to get rid of an of course the Bender property was willing to take it and that is how the 7 feet of fill got put over the septic tank, wherever it may be. Peggy is fairly certain that the plans were not, that the system was not built as the plans. I am going to call Mr. Nye who sort of developed this project back in the day and see who actually installed the septic system if he can remember that to help us. But here is my concern, these young ladies that own the property, are very concerned about this whole project. I think you have heard Peggy's comments that they want to make sure nothing happens and the authority will be responsible. They gave Troy a couple fairly extensive things they wanted to have including any agreements and so forth and I don't know what your feelings are but, it seems to me in order to avoid this whole problem. Because the other aspect is they have a sign there, that would have to be taken down, moved, and they told me the second time that I was there that they would insist that the driveway be kept open at all times, which they don't even own by the way, but it had to be open. And I just see a real nightmare on this property and if it is possible if you folks would agree to allow Rettew to move the line from their property to the side of the road into Mt Rock Rd, which is a township road, so we are not dealing with Penn Dot for that piece, I think we would be avoiding a lot of problems because I can see 2,3,4 years from now, this septic system fails and I can assure you that the authority will be asked to build them a new septic system.

(MP) What is the downside to moving the line into the road?

(DH) A little bit more cost most likely, I would have to look and see there are some issues there because I don't know where that culvert is in relationship to their property line.

(JE) it is on their property because they were made to build that, they had to replace all of that ballast that is what she told us anyways.

(PM) She was very concerned with the culvert

(JE) very concerned

(DH) It would be difficult to stay in the road, the whole length of their property because the reason that we put it on their property was to miss this culvert that is in Mt Rock Rd and the difficulties in getting the line passed that culvert. We didn't think we could go over it we didn't want to go under it.

(SB) Why aren't we on the other side of the road?

(DH) There is not a lot over on the other side, we did look at it.

(JE) Why can't we cross even before we get there? Can we not get into this area and then cut across?

(SB) is that what you are saying move the RTE 81 cross?

(JE) yes

(ET) Did we get approval for that yet?

(DH) yes

(JE) we did

(DH) that one we have

(SB) For under RTE 81?

(DH) and 81 we have

(ET) for that one spot

(DH) yes, we would have to reapply most likely

(SB) so there is not room on other side

(DH) on the other side of Mt. Rock Road, I think we came away with the belief that there was not, we walked this whole, I walked this with my construction guy and we came away believing that the best place to put it was where it is now.

(JE) What about just going to the other side of the right of way on the south side of the Mt Rock Rd?

(DH) We did look at that and came away with it is not a very good place we can relook at it now that we know about the problems. Now the other option is

(MP) excuse me, Dennis, could you please get with Peggy and John and come up with some other possibilities that could avoid the trouble with the Bender property. That might in the end relieve them a whole lot of stress and relieve us of a lot of stress, and if it doesn't cost too much, it might be a great solution.

(FM) I just issues down the road for that property, that just aren't going to go away

(MP) Anything else?

(DH) one thing, since we are talking about easements I brought a schedule, I don't want to discuss it. I want to look for the purposes of monitoring progress of getting the water line in the ground and I think I have not seen the agreement with CVRDC, but I believe we gave a date when we were going to be done. And we agreed that you would monitor monthly at our meetings to look at progress. This is the schedule that I am going to include as part of that report in a monthly meeting, but I thought it would be important to get probably you, Michael and John and Forest if he wants one. That schedule assumed that we were going to have easements by now and also assumed that one of our, ENS would be back by now, but has not gotten back. We are slipping a little bit we built in a buffer, but I just want everybody to understand where we stand with what is going on and I didn't want it to go any longer. So I have copies that I will give out.

(FM) I will report I have all the easements except Bender and CVRDC and the issue with CVRDC is, you and I need to get together because they are representing to me that the property where we need the easement is owned by Matrix. So I need to verify that and if you can look, I don't Matrix will be a problem but CVRDC isn't going to sign an easement.

(MP) so you guys get together on that, anything else?

(TP) nothing further

(FM) nope

(SB) I just want to verify, we are coming to our next meeting with other options to be able to get around this Bender tract, with other options and how we move forward with those options including if we come with an option we can communicate with Forest, before you come back to us, so that Forest knows what he needs to be doing.

(DH) Yes, because it is going to impact easements, if we go another route it is going to impact easements.

(KB) next meeting date

(ET) that is election night

(KB) I won't be here I work elections, just as an FYI . I was fairly certain that didn't we talk about moving?

(JE) we talked about it when it was scheduled, and said we would deal with it as we went along.

(MP) Here we are

(KB) just for future reference, general and primary election evenings I can never be here. I am always receiving ballots.

(MP) let's look at our calendars

(KB) I am only one person, you can't be here either, and don't you work?

(ET) I don't know yet

(KB) are they going to tell you the day before?

(ET) I have a feeling that may happen this year

(KB) there is a decent chance that Angelo may not be here either, because he is poll worker.

(ET) they get me for security

(MP) is this room used on the 15th is it a council night?

(KB) yes

(MP) so we could go, 16th or Monday 14th

(KB) or the 9th?

(ET) 7th?

(MP) I could do the evening of the 7th, personally how about everybody else?

(SB) that is first Monday? I think I am good on the 1st Monday.

(KB) I can do the 14th but not the 16th

(MP) how about the 7th, are we good with the 7th? I think everybody is onboard with the 7th. So we will move our meeting to the 7th from the 8th.

(JE) yes sir I will take care of it

(MP) properly advertise that please, and thank you for bringing that up. Anything else? Kerri?

(KB) the whole thing with Well #3, I think pretty much everybody was in here when I talked to Peggy about it.

(PM) I did review 2015 data and it was appearing in 2015, I have not had a chance to look at 2014, yet

(KB) so all of 2015 it was happening

(PM) yes

(FM) John had a passed off a family that owns a piece of property out on, that uses the road that we own the right of way out at the farmland at Mr. Witter's Farm.

(JE) Behind the solar array

(FM) So she owns a piece of property and there is a right of way and we own the right of way. I wrote her a letter and she was complaining that people were driving through and causing dust and everything.

(JE) She called me at home she called me here, several times

(FM) I wrote her a letter and told her basically, that is too bad because the authority doesn't have any control or can take any control. And now she has written a letter back and says since you own it, you have to maintain it and you have to plow the snow. We own the right of way, and I will write a response to this in case somebody calls you. There is no responsibility by the owner of the property that gives the right of way to somebody to maintain the right of way. If they want it smooth, they can do it, if they want the snow plowed they can do that, it is not your responsibility as an authority to do any of this.

(JE) She obviously did not like the answer she got so this was her response.

(MP) so you will communicate back

(MP) Angelo? Peggy? Thank you for coming to this special meeting, I know it is another night out, and I really appreciate you being here, thank you for your contributions everybody. I think these are significant issues that we have to deal with, and everyone has put forth a great effort.

(KB) when are we doing our budget workshop?

(MP) We just got our budgets, Steve and I are looking at them, we will start getting together and by next meeting we should already have our first look.

(SB) motion to adjourn

(ET) second



Secretary

Next meeting November 7, 2016