

**PETERS TOWNSHIP
SANITARY AUTHORITY**

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



James J. Miskis, Manager
Mark A. Chucuddy, Asst. Manager
Patricia L. Foote, Financial Controller
Diane L. Gregor, Admin. Assistant

AGENDA

REGULAR MEETING

October 23, 2007

ROLL CALL:

ENGINEER'S REPORT: Presentation of Phase A Brush Run Peak Flow Optimization Study

ADJOURNMENT:

**PETERS TOWNSHIP
SANITARY AUTHORITY**

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



James J. Miskis, Manager
Mark A. Chucuddy, Asst. Manager
Patricia L. Foote, Financial Controller
Diane L. Gregor, Administrative Assistant

2nd REGULAR MEETING

October 23, 2007

ROLL CALL:

The second regularly scheduled meeting of the Peters Township Sanitary Authority was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by the Chairman. Board members present were G. Robert Jacobs, John P. Slagle, Denver E. Yingling, and George A. Khalouf. Also present were; Mark Poole, HDR Engineering Inc., Kimberly Kennedy, HDR Engineering, Dan Godwin, HDR Engineering, James J. Miskis, Manager, and Mark A. Chucuddy, Assistant Manager. Absent from the meeting was James E. Schafer, Board Member.

The purpose of convening the second meeting was to provide the opportunity for HDR Engineering to present the findings of the “Brush Run Wet Weather Optimization Study: Phase A Report” to the Board.

Mr. Poole presented a Power Point Presentation of the report which outlined the objectives of the study, how to obtain those objectives, a summary of the components of the study, and finally the recommendations derived from the study.

Mr. Jacobs asked whether HDR had looked at “blending” as part of the study and would it benefit the Authority. Mr. Poole replied that they did not look at it very closely as the PaDEP is not apt to approve the concept at the current time. He indicated that this is certainly something that can be revisited in the future.

Mr. Miskis indicated the table in the report contained only those peak flow events over 8.5 MGD because that is the Peak Design Flow the plant was rated for.

Mr. Miskis asked HDR Engineering if they were in agreement that effluent pumping has to be part of the solution. The HDR team was in agreement. A discussion ensued concerning the use of “portable pumps” opposed to the permanent installation that was proposed in the report, and the pros and cons of each. Mr. Poole indicated they did not include the alternative of portable pumps, but indicated after hearing Mr. Miskis’ concept of only pumping a portion of the peak flow they will re-evaluate this alternative.

Mr. Yingling asked why not install another outfall pipe at a high elevation in lieu of pumping. Both Mr. Miskis and Mr. Poole indicated that this may work at the current discharge point which is across Valleybrook Road, but due to the flood elevation of the stream at the chlorine contact tank, it may not work there. HDR will also evaluate this concept.

Mr. Khalouf inquired if HDR anticipated having any problems with the regulatory agencies in obtaining final approvals. Mr. Poole responded by saying that in the past as long as they can

prove through modeling or stress testing that the treatment plant will perform, they have not had any issues.

Mr. Miskis reiterated the background for the secondary objective of the study which is to obtain maximum monthly design rating of 2.3 MGD, and indicated that it should be more adequately addressed in the report.

Mr. Poole stated that the secondary recommendation to increase chlorine contact time will become a primary recommendation as at the higher flow rates we will not be able to meet DEP's minimum requirement for contact time.

Mr. Miskis pointed out that looking at the cost estimate HDR may have misinterpreted the Authority's concept of increasing the height of the digester walls. He presented photos showing the small portion at the head of the tank as the only portion requiring height adjustment. Mr. Poole indicated that they looked at increasing the height for the entire perimeter, and will re-evaluate now that he has a clearer understanding.

Mr. Miskis presented a brief project cost summary of the four practical alternatives.

A Motion was made by Mr. Khalouf and seconded by Mr. Yingling to adjourn the meeting at 9:50 p.m. The Motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark A. Chucuddy