

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop Meeting held February 16, 2010

An administrative workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6:04 p.m. by Chairman William B. Hawk on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Supervisors present in addition to Mr. Hawk were: William C. Seeds, Sr., Gary A. Crissman, and David B. Blain.

Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steve Stine, Township Solicitor; Sam Robbins, Public Works Director; Steve Fleming, HRG, Inc., Township Engineer; and Watson Fisher and Ted Robertson, SWAN.

**Pledge of Allegiance**

Mr. Crissman led in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Public Comment**

Mr. Hawk noted that Mitchell Loser, from Troop 256, Faith Presbyterian Church, is present and he is working on his "Citizenship in the Community" badge. He explained to Mr. Loser that he should feel free to ask questions during the Workshop Meeting

Storm Stories and what has been learned from the two history making  
snow emergencies that occurred between 2/6 and 2/15

Mr. Wolfe displayed a power point presentation showing some of the worst locations from the most recent snow storm. He noted that most of the pictures are from the south side of the Township, where there were many problems with drifting snow. He noted, in certain locations, the drifts were as much as ten feet in height. He noted that up to 33 inches of snow fell from the two snow events, the first occurring on February 6<sup>th</sup> and the second one starting on February 9<sup>th</sup>. He noted, as a result of the high snow amounts and blizzard conditions, it took up to 48 hours to open up the roads in the Township. He noted that the Public Works Department was hampered by the fact that there was nowhere to place the snow from the second snow event.

Mr. Wolfe explained that the Township maintains over 400 lane miles of road using more than 40 pieces of equipment. He noted that there is a priority process for maintaining the roadways, starting with state routes, followed by municipal collector roads, neighborhood streets, and dead-end streets and cul-de-sacs. He noted, if the snowfall totals more than six inches, the Township will plow the alleys. He noted that the dead-end streets, cul-de-sacs and alleys are more difficult to maintain since the trucks must backup to remove the snow as the plow cannot clear those areas with a forward movement. In addition, the driver must find a place to place the snow.

Mr. Wolfe noted that detailed communications occurred between the Public Works Department, Police, Fire and SCEMS during the snow event. He noted if a street needed to be plowed for any type of emergency event, a plow was dispatched to open the roadway.

Mr. Wolfe noted that some residents questioned why some roads were cleared to the blacktop while others still had a layer of snow. Mr. Robbins explained that some roads are pretreated with salt that helps when plowing the snow, as the snow does not bond to the road surface. He noted that this works when the temperature is 32 degrees and above. He noted when this does not occur, traffic stamps the snow on the road, and it creates a layer of snow that the plow cannot remove. In this instance, it takes a longer time for the salt materials to melt the snow.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township does not provide winter maintenance on unopened streets, private streets, or street in new developments that have not been formally dedicated to the Township. He noted that plow operators do not purposely plow driveways shut, but if a person has opened their driveway and a snow plow operator is moving snow, it will take the least path of resistance. He noted that during a snow emergency, the Township suspends the policy requiring sidewalks to be shoveled within 24 hours of the end of a storm. He noted that property owners are still responsible for shoveling the snow from the sidewalks. He noted that the Township recently enacted a mailbox replacement policy.

Mr. Wolfe provided the Board members of a copy of the snow declaration and explained that he is authorize to declare a snow emergency if it is deemed necessary, and he did so on February 6<sup>th</sup> and February 9<sup>th</sup>. He noted that the Board was informed of this as per the Township's Ordinance requirement. He noted for the February 9<sup>th</sup> event, trash collection was suspended for three days. Mr. Crissman noted that Waste Management initiated their phone alert

system, and he suggested that it was a very good interface between the Township and Waste Management. Mr. Seeds questioned if the Township requested this service from Waste Management. Mr. Wolfe answered that Waste Management normally informs the Township of its intent to delay pickups. He noted that they have done this in the past for other weather-related events.

Mr. Wolfe explained that the Township contracted with Handwerk Site Contractors for two trucks for ten hours of service on Thursday, February 11th. He noted that the rate for the two trucks and operators was \$250 per hour, and Handwerk assisted in opening some of the roads that had drifted shut.

Mr. Wolfe explained that Mr. Blain requested to have Mr. Robbins attend the meeting to discuss the past weeks events.

Mr. Robbins explained, although the Township has experienced snow events in the past, it has not experienced the high winds that hampered the snow removal. He noted that the pickup trucks and one-ton trucks as well as the 550 trucks could not push that depth of snow. He noted that for the Spring Creek Road area, he normally uses a loader truck to remove snow, and it had to be pulled from that area to work McIntosh Road, Crums Mill Road and Red Top Road. He noted that the grader truck was not useful as it does not do well in snow over ten inches high, as it rolls over the snow. He noted, during the heaviest part of the storm, from 3 a.m. until 4 p.m. Public Works personnel did all they could do to keep the main roads passable. Mr. Hawk noted that the Township has many large areas of open spaces, more so than some of the surrounding areas, and the wind played havoc on the adjoining roads. He reported that he attended a function on Saturday morning, and heard numerous comments about the outstanding job the Public Works personnel performed. He noted that Mr. Robbins and his personnel need to know this. He noted that 400 lane miles is more lane miles than most townships have.

Mr. Robbins explained that his personnel needed to make three or four passes for some of the roads and that tripled the total number of lane miles. He noted that his staff was hampered by the small pickup trucks that could not enter developments and clear the snow as is there usual practice. He noted, once a large snow plow opened the road, then the pickup trucks were able to work the streets. Mr. Hawk noted that he drove in other townships, and was surprised that the Township was able to clear the amount of streets it did, in comparison to the other townships. Mr. Robbins stated that he would relay Mr. Hawk's comments to his staff.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the trucks had chains. Mr. Robbins answered that all the trucks were equipped with chains, and noted that they went through a lot of chains in the past week.

Mr. Robbins noted that once the main roads were cleared from the drifting snow on Thursday morning, around eleven o'clock, his personnel started to work on the developments. He noted that it typically takes his staff eight to ten hours to clear snow in the Township, but this event took 13 hours. He noted that it helped when it had stopped snowing and the wind had died down.

Mr. Robbins explained that his personnel was in constant contact with the Emergency Operations Center, and they were asked by PENNDOT to push snow to block the on and off ramps for I-81 and I-83. Mr. Crissman questioned how much time this took from the normal snow plowing activities. Mr. Robbins answered that staff spent three to four hours plowing the ramps shut.

Mr. Robbins noted that he handled several emergency calls, transporting several doctors to hospitals; a staff member had to be transported to the hospital for a possible heart attack, several homes ran out of fuel oil, and the streets had to be plowed for access for these events. He noted that staff had to plow a driveway and shovel a sidewalk for an elderly woman who needed medication in order for a nurse to administered medication.

Mr. Loser questioned what the biggest problem the Township faced in removing the snow. Mr. Robbins answered that once the snow stopped, the wind pick up which caused very high drifts and the smaller plows could not move that snow. He noted that he had to reallocate the equipment to get the job done.

Mr. Robbins noted that the Township was flooded with calls from the residents asking when their road would be plowed, and why some roads were done before their street was plowed. He noted that the public does not understand the method that is used to keep the main roads passable. He noted that the three staff mechanics work continuously to keep the equipment operating, and had to make several trips to dealerships that were closed in the early morning hours to get parts to keep the trucks running. He noted that a grader truck broke down on Blue Mountain and the mechanics had to repair it to get it running again. He noted that his staff is ready to go for the next storm. Mr. Seeds questioned what machinery is used to plow the mountain roads. Mr. Robbins noted that he typically uses the grader, plowing the snow up to the top of the Mountain where its meets the Middle Paxton Township plows on the other side.

Mr. Hawk noted that he had heard that the operators were working up to 40 hours straight, and he questioned if they would reach a fatigue factor. Mr. Robbins explained that he pulled all the staff into the office on Wednesday evening for a meal at 5 p.m. He noted at this time they were into the storm for almost 30 hours. He explained that he fed the personnel and made them take an eight-hour break; some employees went home while others slept in their cars. He noted that the personnel that went home were picked up at 3:30 a.m. and they started to plow the roads around 4:30 a.m. He noted that he had to make his personnel take a break during this storm. He noted that staff did a wonderful job, and once they were able to get into the developments, they were able to get the streets cleared in about 12 hours. He noted that staff continued to do more snow removal today in the developments.

Mr. Seeds questioned where the budget is for snow removal. Mr. Wolfe answered that he does not know how much the budget is over, but it most certainly is. Mr. Crissman noted that everyone's budget for snow removal is over. Mr. Wolfe noted that the City of Lancaster has announced that they have no money for road paving in 2010, and would only be able to patch the roads.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Epstein, on behalf of SWAN, sent a positive letter to the Township regarding the snow removal process. He thanked Mr. Fisher for the letter.

Mr. Crissman thanks Mr. Robbins for taking the time to share his information with the Board members.

Review of HRG, Inc., proposal to engineer EECBG improvements  
for the Friendship Center and Public Works buildings

Mr. Wolfe explained that the Township is a direct entitlement community for a grant in the amount of \$185,200 from the Department of Energy for specific energy improvements. He noted that the application process was very time consuming. He explained that the application was submitted for work for lighting and insulation improvements for the Public Works Building and insulation for the gymnasium at the Friendship Center. He noted that HRG, Inc. has provided the Township with a proposal to complete the design documents, bid specifications, and project inspection for the work. He noted that Steve Fleming is present to discuss HRG, Inc.'s proposal.

Mr. Fleming explained that he has worked with Mr. Luetchford and Mr. Robbins to identify energy savings opportunities for the Public Works facility and the Friendship Center. He

noted that HRG, Inc. prepared a feasibility study that was used as part of the grant application. He noted that HRG, Inc. has prepared a proposal for services to implement the project, to bid the improvements, as well as carry the project through to construction, to include conducting the necessary inspections, and follow through with the required paperwork. He explained that HRG, Inc. has an electrical division in-house, that will be doing a large portion of the specialized work for the proposal.

Mr. Fleming explained that the scope of services would include: preparation of the electronic bid documents and drawings; plans for both facilities as well as details of the improvements and specifications of the required materials, field survey work, provide bid documents that comply with the block grant requirements and Township's public bid requirements. He noted that the scope would also include follow-up meetings, and preparing a cost estimate for the overall project.

Mr. Fleming noted that Bradley Straub, project manager for the electrical group at HRG, Inc., prepared the proposal. Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Straub would be the project manager. Mr. Fleming answered no, and explained that he would continue to be the lead project manager, and would consult with Mr. Straub as needed. He noted that he would be involved in the project to include pre-bid meetings, bid openings and other meetings.

Mr. Fleming explained that the total estimated costs for HRG, Inc.'s services are \$17,900. Mr. Hawk noted that deducting the proposal amount would leave \$167,000 to complete the project from the grant funds. Mr. Fleming noted that he met with staff last week, to review the proposal and to identify areas where money could be saved in the services for the proposal, and as a result he estimates that there could be an opportunity to save an additional \$4,000 from the original proposal. He noted that the proposal was written as a "time and material" proposal in order to save funds for the hours not used in designing the project. He noted that any hours HRG, Inc. does not use, the Township would not pay for. He noted that all cost savings would be passed along to the Township.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the maximum fee would be \$17,900, and anything less would be a bonus. Mr. Fleming answered yes. Mr. Crissman suggested that the letter states that the amount could be higher. Mr. Fleming noted, with the scope of work contained in the letter, the maximum fee would be \$17,900. Mr. Crissman questioned if the fee could be less. Mr. Fleming answered that it could be less, and most likely will be less. He noted when he met with staff; he

reviewed the scope of work to search for opportunities to save money. He noted that the Township had drawings on file and he determined that he could use those drawings instead of recreating them, and this would save \$2,500. He noted that there are additional services that Township staff can assist with. He noted that he hopes to bring the project in \$4,000 under the estimate.

Mr. Fleming noted that the proposal considered the entire project as follows: preparing the documents, the bid process, inspections during construction, review of all payroll certifications, and project close out.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the insulation at the Friendship Center is for the natatorium area. Mr. Wolfe answered that the insulation would only be installed in the gymnasium. He noted that the terms of the grant do not permit swimming pool improvements. Mr. Crissman noted that acoustical insulation will be installed for the gymnasium and weight-lifting areas. Mr. Seeds questioned if the estimate for savings was included in the proposal. Mr. Wolfe noted that HRG, Inc. prepared an estimate for savings, and it was included in the grant application. Mr. Seeds questioned if the majority of insulation would be the spray-on type. Mr. Fleming answered that two types of insulation would be installed, and he would work with staff to select the correct product for the correct application. He noted one type is a vinyl back insulation which is fastened and the other is a spray-on insulation which is physically sprayed on the surface and adheres itself to the surface. Mr. Seeds noted in addition to the energy costs savings; this would help with sound insulation as well. Mr. Fleming noted that the process would blanket one of the hard surfaces in the gymnasium to absorb the sound or reflect it.

Mr. Seeds questioned what the cost estimate was for the two projects. Mr. Fleming answered that he has not prepared a final estimate yet; however, he suggested that the estimate would be approximately between \$150,000 to \$165,000. Mr. Seeds questioned if the price was inclusive for both projects. Mr. Fleming answered yes.

Mr. Hawk questioned how long it would take to complete both projects. Mr. Fleming answered that the goal is to complete the projects by June 6, 2010, as this date is related in the grant. Mr. Wolfe noted that all the work would be done this year.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the work to be done at the Public Works building would impact any future additions. Mr. Robbins answered that the work for the project involves insulation and replacing the current light fixtures. He noted that additional insulation will be added to the

current insulation to reduce the heating costs. Mr. Fleming noted, in the areas that a future expansion could occur, the vinyl back insulation would be used as it could be removed and replaced for any future additions.

Mr. Crissman questioned how much down time would be needed at the FC for the work to be done. Mr. Fleming answered that it would be a very quick process. Mr. Crissman questioned if the work could be done at night after the FC is closed. Mr. Hawk noted that it would be a good solution as long as the Township does not have to pay a premium price for night work. Mr. Fleming answered that he would instruct the contractor that he would not be able to close off an entire area when doing the work. Mr. Seeds questioned if the work would be done during the day. Mr. Fleming suggested that the contractor would want to work during the day but he could open it to nighttime work if the contractor would want to do it at night. Mr. Seeds noted that it is more costly when working during operational hours as there would be a need for more safety precautions for the clients. Mr. Fleming noted that it would be important to keep the members out of the construction area, but he noted that he would write the contract to allow the contractor to make the assessment. He noted that he would leave it open to allow the work to be done at night, but not require that it be done at night.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the contract is on this evening's business meeting agenda. He questioned if the Board would be in agreement to the HRG, Inc. proposal with the wording, "not to exceed \$17,900," for the work. Mr. Fleming noted that it would be a "time and material" project not to exceed \$17,900. The Board members agreed to the revised wording.

Request from the Colonial Park Fire Company to amend its 2010 budget  
to accommodate repair for Truck 33

Mr. Wolfe explained that the Colonial Park Fire Company requested permission from the Board to amend their budget for 2010 to allow them to undertake unexpected maintenance for a piece of apparatus. He noted that the estimate to make the repairs was \$6,000 higher than originally estimated and budgeted. He noted that the request explains how they plan to reallocated their funds. Mr. Crissman questioned if there was any reason not to allow the fire company to amend their budget. Mr. Wolfe answered no. Mr. Wolfe explained, normally, he would have written a response to the Colonial Park Fire Company granting their request; however, there was some confusion with the original request made to him. He noted that Mr.

Coburn originally requested the Township to pay the \$6,000, and he explained to him that he would need a written request. He noted when Mr. Byerly, President of the Colonial Park Fire Company wrote the letter, he only requested to amend the budget and did not request the extra funds from the Township. He noted that Mr. Coburn was confused as to what they were asking. Mr. Crissman noted that he had no problem with the fire company reallocating their budget to complete the maintenance repairs.

Status report on continued problems with the  
Friendship Center natatorium leisure pool liner

Mr. Wolfe displayed pictures of the problems that have occurred with the leisure pool liner. He noted that water is blowing from the port into the space between the liner and the wall of the pool. He explained that RenoSys Corporation came to repair the liner but determined that the entire liner had to be removed and replaced. He noted that double flanges would be installed at all drain areas, and that the RenoSys Corporation would install a new liner at no cost to the Township. He noted that they are preparing the bottom of the pool floor, and will begin to install the felt underlayment prior to the installation of the new liner. He noted that the contractor hopes to have the pool work completed so that the pool could be filled with water on Sunday and then open it for operations on Tuesday. He noted that it would take two days to raise the water temperature to the normal use standard.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the pool has been out of use for two weeks and staff has been very busy reallocating schedules to use the lap pool for many of the programs. Mr. Seeds questioned if only the bottom liner for the pool will be replaced. Mr. Wolfe answered yes, and at no cost to the Township. Mr. Seeds questioned if the liner had a 15-year warranty when it was installed. Mr. Wolfe answered that the pool liner was installed four years ago. Mr. Stine noted that every time the liner was fixed, the warranty was extended to make it 15 years total.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the technician working on the project indicated that the original installer is no longer with the company, and that he did not believe that it was a good installation job. Mr. Wolfe explained that he questioned the technician how many times this type of problem has occurred with a pool and he answered that he never experienced a pool having this type of failure. He noted that the technician explained that the only times he has been called to repair a pool liner is when the liner had been ripped by a foreign object. He noted that it was the

technician's determination to replace the liner, and they are doing more than asked by the Township, and he believes that the people doing the work know what they are doing.

Mr. Crissman noted that the technician seems to have a better understanding of the project. He noted that the technician knew exactly what the problem was and it was his recommendation to remove the liner since the flanges were not installed properly as they needed to be double-flanged. Mr. Seeds noted that when the pool was built there was no liner, and after experiencing problems, it was determined that it would be better to install a liner. Mr. Wolfe explained that the liner was installed was after eight years of use because the pool needed to be re-plastered. He noted that pools that are heavily used need to be re-plastered every eight to ten years at a cost of \$15,000. He noted that the pool liner has a life expectancy of double that and it was determined that using a liner would save having to re-plaster the pool, and provide for a longer life for the pool shell. Mr. Wolfe noted that the pool liner was installed four years ago, and there were holes in the plaster due to the foot traffic. He noted that the lap pool gets much less use than the leisure pool and that is why the liner was installed in the leisure pool. Mr. Crissman noted when members swim in the lap pool; they do not put their feet down on the surface all the time. He noted that the overall wear for both pools is worse in the leisure pool than it would be for the lap pool. Mr. Seeds questioned if the lap pool would have to be redone. Mr. Wolfe answered that he did not think a liner would be installed in the lap pool, as it would be better to re-plaster the lap pool. He noted that staff has painted the lap pool and it extends the life of the plaster. He noted that the only drawback is that the lap pool must be painted each year, as the paint wears off and it wears through the plaster.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the pool should be ready for use on Tuesday, barring any unforeseen complications. Mr. Crissman noted that the representatives from RenoSys Corporation stated that their employees would work this project until it was completed, and they would not be pulled from this job, or another team would not replace them. He noted that they have worked six days straight; however, they are required to have one day off a week. Mr. Wolfe noted that they worked through the storm events, working ten-hour days. Mr. Hawk noted that it was a lot of work for two persons. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it is a two-man job. Mr. Crissman noted that it is important that the work be completed correctly.

Discussion regarding the presentations by Rettew and Delta  
Development to provide strategic planning services

Mr. Wolfe explained that presentations were made at a previous workshop meeting by Rettew Associates and Delta Development Group (DDG) for strategic planning services. He noted that the Board is looking to update the Township's strategic plan from what was developed in 2006, and what has been accomplished as a result of that plan. He explained that Rettew provided the Township with a Community Readiness Proposal, an attempt to assist the Township in identifying its long-term projects and needs. He noted that Rettew would present the Township with a prioritized report, but the proposal does not include assisting in the procuring of funding or doing detailed design work, or taking any project to step two. He noted that the fee for the Rettew proposal is \$4,930.

Mr. Wolfe explained that the Board also entertained a proposal from Delta Development Group that did not include additional services over and above what was mentioned in their proposal. He noted that project and design development were not included in the initial proposal, but DDG explained that they could also provide grant application and lobbying services as well. He noted that the DDG proposal is very detailed and the cost for their proposal was \$26,000; with the alternates the proposal increased to \$36,000. He noted that DDG's proposal also includes assisting the Planning Commission with its Business Improvement District process and Floodplain map revisions.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he has had no further discussion with the presenters other than securing the monetary proposals for the Board members.

Mr. Hawk questioned what the Township needs are in comparing one proposal to the other. He noted that his gut reaction would lean towards Rettew. Mr. Blain noted that the Board never discussed the next step for strategic planning, noting that the two companies just solicited proposals to the Board on their own. Mr. Wolfe explained that staff has discussed the need to update the strategic plan, and Mr. Chlebnikow approached him with the idea of making a presentation to staff on Rettew's new Community Readiness service. He noted that Rettew would assist in identifying the projects, and put them into a format that would make the Township competitive in developing grant applications. He noted that he added Rettew to a workshop agenda, and DDG noticed that Rettew was on the agenda, and DDG approached him

to scheduler a presentation. He noted that both companies made presentations to the Board members during a workshop session and he requested written proposals from both companies.

Mr. Seeds noted that DDG's proposal involves much more work than the Rettew proposal. He suggested that the Township could do the work that Rettew has proposed in-house. Mr. Hawk noted that DDG's proposal could end up being much more as they would prefer to add on additional services.

Mr. Blain questioned why staff and the Board members could not prepare a second strategic plan in-house like it did in 2006. Mr. Wolfe noted that staff and the Board members prepared the previous strategic plan, in-house, and did a good job. He explained that Frank Chlebnikow, a former employee who now works for Rettew, made a presentation to staff regarding a new strategic planning service. He explained that given that the cost for the service was only \$5,000, he felt it was worth looking into further. He wanted the Board members to view Rettew's presentation to get their opinion on their proposal, noting that he did not think anyone could perform the same services that were offered for \$5,000. He noted that the Department Directors were very impressed with the two Rettew employees who had detailed planning knowledge, and well as Mr. Chlebnikow who had detailed knowledge of the Township. He explained that DDG got wind of what was going on and requested to make a presentation to the Board members. He explained that he informed both presenters that the Township may not outsource its strategic planning.

Mr. Hawk suggested that the Rettew proposal could provide a second set of eyes to confirm what the Board has already done and make some refinements to what has been done without paying a large fee for the service.

Mr. Wolfe noted, at staff level, it is time to revisit the strategic planning process, but he questioned whether the Board would prefer to hire an outside firm to assist in the process or to have staff complete the process. He noted if he was to solicit additional proposals, he could come up with numerous ones in a short time, but from a staff perspective, one proposal is reasonable, and the other is out of the Township's price range. Mr. Hawk suggested that DDG pushing the Township further than where it wants to go at this time. Mr. Wolfe noted that DDG would prefer a retainer agreement. Mr. Hawk noted that he was not in favor of that.

Mr. Wolfe noted that both presenters could be invited to make a second presentation or a third party could be interviewed. Mr. Seeds questioned if there was any money in the budget for

this service. Mr. Wolfe answered that it would have to be added to the General Improvement fund. He noted, in lieu of doing a Request For Proposals (RFP) and a formal solicitation, he would prefer to do the next strategic plan in-house. He noted that the time that it takes to develop an RFP, staff could be working on a new strategic plan. He noted that the two qualified firms provided two varying proposals, and at this time, he would not recommend going with the \$26,000 proposal. Mr. Hawk agreed with Mr. Wolfe.

Mr. Blain questioned what Rettew would deliver to the Township. Mr. Wolfe answered that Rettew would deliver a project detailed in a priority format with a schedule that is based upon their internal review of the Township's planning documents, interviews with staff, and Board members, and a needs assessment that they determined through internal investigations with Township personnel. Mr. Seeds questioned if Rettew would come up with a strategic plan or only assist in developing one. Mr. Wolfe answered that they would be doing all the work, and the Board and staff would be assisting them to develop the plan.

Mr. Blain noted that the Board has a good idea as to what the Township's needs are for infrastructure and equipment. He questioned how much equipment would cost, and how staff would lay out the capital expenditures over time. He noted that Rettew's proposal does not spell this out, and for \$5,000 he would not want to pay them to do what staff already knows. Mr. Hawk questioned if \$5,000 is worth confirming what the Board and staff has already done. Mr. Blain questioned why staff would need to confirm what it already has a feel for. Mr. Hawk suggested that it would be similar to getting a second opinion from a surgeon. Mr. Blain suggested that it is not a good comparison, since the Township would be asking someone who knows nothing about the Township to provide an opinion, as opposed to having staff and the Board members provide an opinion on issues they are well aware of. Mr. Hawk noted that he would not feel bad if the decision is made not to hire anyone. Mr. Blain noted that his idea of strategic planning is determining what needs to be done over the next five years and how it would impact the budget and taxation structures in the future. He suggested that this is more important to him.

Mr. Hawk noted that if the Board decided to hire anyone, he would be in favor of hiring Rettew over the Delta Development Group. Mr. Blain noted that he would prefer to do the strategic plan in-house and not spend \$36,000. Mr. Seeds noted that \$5,000 sounds cheap, but he thinks that Rettew would only confirm what the Board already knows. He noted that the only

reason he would consider hiring DDG is because of their assistance in finding funding. He noted that the Township will have to find outside resources for funding many of the future projects. He suggested that funds could be allocated in the 2011 budget for strategic planning.

Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Wolfe how much time and energy it would take staff to conduct a strategic plan. Mr. Wolfe answered that it would be more than a three month process, roughly 40 hours per Department Head overall. Mr. Crissman questioned if it would overtax staff to do this work. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be a nice convenience to have a hired entity doing the grunt work as opposed to putting it together at staff level. Mr. Crissman questioned if the level of service would be diminished by having staff expend the time on the strategic plan. Mr. Wolfe answered no. He noted that staff would not forgo day-to-day operations to work on a strategic plan. He noted that hiring a firm would get to the end product faster than doing it in-house. He suggested that the quality of the product would be the same regardless. Mr. Hawk noted that the Board is trying to save money. Mr. Wolfe noted that he has his answer.

Review of the new Digital Flood Insurance Rate Map, as prepared  
By FEMA, and its affect upon the Township's floodplain management regulations

Mr. Wolfe noted that part of Rettew's proposal was to assist in preparing ordinance amendments that are necessary to comply with the new Federal Emergency Management Association (FEMA) Insurance Rate Map which the Township has recently received. He noted that he has detailed correspondence from FEMA for the new Insurance Rate Maps, and the maps must be adopted by the Board.

Mr. Wolfe displayed the Township's Zoning Map showing the zoning overlay for floodplains. He noted that they are shown as crosshatched areas that overlay the zoning of an underlying district. He noted that no development is permitted in a 100-year floodplain. He noted that these areas are located throughout the Township; however, the Township is not subject to significant flooding or flood damage. He noted that the Township's floodplains are very small in nature. He noted that the current floodplains were generated with maps that were completed in 1974, and have been amended overtime by detailed studies provided by developers, who want to develop a portion of land. He noted that FEMA has determined that it is time to review all municipal maps and to conduct detailed studies. He noted that FEMA has completed this for the Township, and in specific locations, the flood boundaries have changed.

Mr. Wolfe explained that he has reviewed the new maps from FEMA, and in most instances the changes have been very insignificant, and in many instances they have been made to the Township's advantage. He noted that in the area of Lockwillow Avenue from Route 22 to North Mountain Road, the area from the bridge over I-81, three blocks up the hill is labeled as a floodplain. He noted that the stream for the floodplain is along the Interstate, and the only way the area is going to flood is if Noah builds another ark. He noted that the area is 15 feet above the basin, however, the Township's zoning states that the area is in a floodplain, and these properties have to comply with land development under very restrictive terms, requiring the people who live along these streets to have flood insurance. He noted that the new maps corrected this problem. He noted in most instances, problems like this have been corrected, and the area of floodplain has decreased or been moved to a more appropriate location. Mr. Seeds noted that there may be some people who are currently paying flood insurance who would not have to once the new maps are adopted.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the new map will be problematic in that some of the land that was formerly developable will now be un-developable. He noted that the Board is going to have to adopt the new maps and will have to respond to the property owners who will find out that they are now in a floodplain and have to come under the regulations of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps. He noted that it is mandatory that the Township take this action.

Mr. Seeds questioned if FEMA engineer's studied the Township to revise the maps. Mr. Wolfe noted that he does not know how FEMA made the determinations to revise the maps, as they never alerted the Township that they were doing this. He noted that the letter that he recently received from FEMA was dated October 30, 2009, and in the body of the letter, it states that the Township must respond to the letter by February 12, 2010.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board will have to take action to adopt the new Flood Insurance Rate Maps and the community will have to live with it. Mr. Crissman questioned if there is a phone number to contact a FEMA representative for questions.

Mr. Wolfe noted that, in the past, when FEMA issued letters of map revision for detailed analysis to state that the floodplain is not where it is supposed to be, building have been built over those properties by the time the Township received the information. He noted that there is a stream running under the Babies-R-Us building in Paxton Towne Centre.

“Otta Know” Presentation: The new residential  
sprinkler requirement in the PA UCC

Mr. Wolfe explained that the Pennsylvania Uniform Construction Code (PA UCC) requires sprinklers for all multi-family residences in 2010, and in 2011, sprinklers will be required in all single-family dwellings. He noted that the Township has no choice in the matter of following the regulations; however, the regulations are under appeal by the Home Builders Association. He noted that a developer has a townhome unit with three units in one building, and one unit was under contract prior to January 1, 2010. He noted, since it was under contract before the first of the year, the unit does not have to be built with sprinklers, however the other two units will have to be sprinkled. He suggested that there will be numerous code conflicts, and the legislation may be repealed, but in the meantime, developers will have to install sprinkler systems. He noted that it will create a tremendous amount of confusion in the building community. Mr. Seeds questioned if any townhomes are being built now with sprinkler systems. Mr. Wolfe answered that the builder is appealing to the Appeal’s Board, through the Capital Region Council of Governments. Mr. Seeds suggested that the decision could be appealed to the Commonwealth Commons Plea Court.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the Township must adopt these changes. Mr. Stine noted that the Township has adopted the PA UCC, and Labor and Industry determines what revisions should be made. Mr. Seeds questioned if the Township could opt out of the PA UCC. Mr. Stine noted that the Township would have to opt out of the entire UCC. Mr. Seeds questioned what is proposed for homes with wells, and storage tanks. Mr. Stine noted that the developer would have to do whatever the building code states. Mr. Seeds noted that no one would be able to afford to build a home with all these extra add-ons.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to suspend the meeting at 7:30 p.m. in order to convene the Board’s business meeting.

Mr. Hawk reconvened the workshop meeting at 8:07 p.m.

Discussion regarding the presentations by TelVue and  
Innermedia to provide PEG TV programming services

Mr. Wolfe explained that he would display a site for TelVue for the Pennsylvania, Education and Government (PEG) TV for the Board members to watch. He noted that the Board

entertained proposals for both TelVue and Innermedia and he requested both to provide him with a working sample, and at this point, only TelVue has responded. He explained the site that he would be showing is for Carlisle/Concord, Massachusetts. He noted that the site is programmed using TelVue technology, noting that the startup costs are roughly \$15,000, in addition to a monthly fee of \$250. He noted that the software is used internally with programming supplied by the Township and TelVue. He noted that they would also provide an interface with the website, noting that the Board members are currently viewing the TelVue by way of their website. Mr. Wolfe noted that TelVue would provide local weather conditions as part of their programming.

Mr. Wolfe explained that the presentation is made up of pictures that are added to a web page, using an audio background. Mr. Crissman questioned how long Carlisle/Concord has used the TelVue service. Mr. Wolfe answered that he did not know. He explained that the quality of the picture would be much better on live television as opposed to web viewing. He noted that much of the sample the Board members are watching is a power point presentation.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the other samples are very similar noting that the information is made up with information for a community calendar. Mr. Crissman noted that the Brigantine New Jersey site is also an example of a TelVue product.

Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Malesic from the Central Dauphin School District showed an interest in these types of services. Mr. Wolfe noted that the School Board has discussed broadcasting their meetings for a long time, but have not moved any closer to doing it. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would have been very good to have had access to this channel during the recent snow emergency as it would have been a great means to communicate with the citizens. He noted that the Township will be able to televise the Board meetings on Verizon as soon as they finish the installation for the cable connection. He explained that Verizon was delayed in finishing the work as a result of the recent snow events, however, the Township will be able to televise its Board meetings very soon, using a 24/7 channel. He noted that using TelVue or Innermedia's services, the Township could program Channel 22 24/7. He noted that it would be his recommendation to hire one of the firms as it would be embarrassing to have a channel sit vacant for most of the time.

Mr. Wolfe questioned the Board members if they had a preference for the two presentations made during the January Workshop meeting. Mr. Hawk noted that it was a toss up to him, noting that Innermedia's presentation was more costly. Mr. Crissman answered that he

liked TelVue's presentation. Mr. Wolfe noted that the representative from TelVue has been excellent in her follow up with him since she made her presentation, contacting him every two or three days. He noted that he contacted the gentleman from Innermedia, asking for links to his sites, and he has not received any response. Mr. Wolfe noted that Innermedia has lower up-front costs, but higher maintenance fees. Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Wolfe needed to talk to another TelVue client. Mr. Wolfe answered that he spoke to someone from Carroll Township in Dillsburg and they like it very much. Mr. Seeds noted that he would prefer to use TelVue.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Township would not be allowed to sell advertising on the channel. He questioned if a business owner could have 15 minute segments scattered through the programming, noting that he would be willing to pay a fair amount of money to do that. He questioned if the Township could raise enough funds to justify doing some nice programming. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township could provide public service announcements but no advertising. He noted, once the Township starts to take business away from the cable operators and television stations, then complaints could be filed against the Township. Mr. Hornung noted that the Township channel could highlight a business. Mr. Wolfe noted that the PCN channel does that in that it will take a half-hour segment to highlight a business in the State. Mr. Hawk noted that PCN did that for his art gallery.

Mr. Wolfe explained that when the Capital Region Council of Governments interviewed the two presenters, TelVue had a model based upon sponsorships and public service ads, and TelVue stated that they did not do that anymore. He noted that Innermedia, previously did not promote public service ads and now their model is based upon public service ads. He noted that he did not know the reason for the changes made by both providers. He noted that TelVue stated, if the Township wanted to do public service ads, it would be up to the individual channel operator, whereas, Innermedia would assist the Township in doing those ads. He suggested that it is a potential revenue resource for the Township. Mr. Hornung noted that he agreed with Mr. Wolfe, and suggested that it could lend to hiring someone to manage the channel. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township could run ads that the business would prepare. He noted that the Friendship Center paid to create two public service ads made for local television programming. He noted that it did not cost much money to create the two minute and 30-second ads.

Mr. Wolfe noted if the Board is interested in the concept he could continue to do more research, but he questioned if the Board had a preference for a provider. Mr. Crissman noted that he liked TelVue. Mr. Wolfe noted that it seems to be the consensus for the Board members.

Additional comments to the proposed subdivision and land development ordinance from SWAN and Triple Crown Corporation

Mr. Wolfe noted that staff received comments from the Stray Winds Area Neighbors (SWAN) and from Triple Crown Corporation regarding the proposed subdivision and land development ordinance. He noted that SWAN requested to be put on the Planning Commission agenda to discuss these issues in March. He noted that the Board members would discuss this during a workshop meeting after the Planning Commission and the Dauphin County Planning Commission meetings.

Mr. Wolfe explained that SWAN has made several suggestions under the definition section. Swan suggested that the definition of Alteration should include activities below grade to a dept of 12-feet to include basements. He noted that they requested that the One Hundred Year Flood Plain also include the 30 and 50 year floodplains for regulation. He noted that this request was made prior to the Township receiving the new FEMA Floodplain maps. He noted that they requested that future right-of-way use PENNDOT's alternate name, Ultimate-Right-of Way. He noted that the request was made to determine what creeks would be included in the Main Stem or Main Channel. He noted that they requested that a definition for multi-user driveway be added and that it be treated as a private street, and have specific signage making it easier for EMS to respond to incidents. He noted that they requested that public-right-of way be added to the list of definitions. He noted that they added to the definition in regard to storage indication method by adding additional wording "over a given time period". And lastly, they requested additional wordage for street width to include "shorter of the distance". He noted that these recommendations would be provided to HRG, Inc. for their review in regards to the new subdivision and land development ordinance.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Stine has provided comments in regards to the comments received from Triple Crown Corporation (TCC) in their letter addressed to Mr. Luetchford on November 23, 2009.

Mr. Stine noted that TCC's first comment dealt with how the recreation fee is determined. He noted that they described it as an equity buy-in, similar to impact fees for transportation. He noted that recreation fees are not governed by that formula. He noted that they are governed by a separate section in the Municipal Planning Code (MPC) and the only guideline in that section is that the land to be dedicated or the fee to be paid has to be reasonable in relationship to the use of the park by the inhabitants of the future development. He noted that there is no requirement to adopt TCC's equity buy-in theory.

Mr. Stine noted that TCC makes mathematical calculations on the parkland that he believes the ordinance requests to be dedicated. He noted that TCC makes the statement that the amount of land is ten times the current amount, but he compared dwelling units to persons and if you compare dwelling units to dwelling units, or persons to persons, it is about 2.7 times the existing amount of parkland that would be dedicated in the new ordinance. He noted that TCC talks about an appraisal process and he noted that there is nothing in the ordinance to address this process. He suggested that it may have been in an earlier version of the draft. He noted that the proposed method is to figure a fee based upon an average lot price. He noted that TCC made a comment regarding language that is in the goal section, but he noted that a goal is not a requirement. He noted that TCC wanted to remove a provision that precludes dedication of recreation land from reducing open space. He noted that he did not think that the Township currently allows that, so he did not think that this was a new issue. He noted that TCC requests flexibility in this area and he suggested that if flexibility is needed, the waiver process is always available. He noted that TCC requests the ordinance reduce the square footage of land dedication required from 1,841 to 174 square feet. He noted that due to the mathematical calculations, stated earlier, this is not warranted. He noted that TCC requests that the ordinance be amended to give credit to a developer for work in preparing land for its purpose. He noted that the land dedicated is required to comply with the standards set forth in the ordinance. He noted if the developer wants to dedicate land on which he must perform work in order to have it meet the ordinance requirements, he should not receive a credit for the cost of the work. He noted that TCC feels that the Township should accept land that contains stormwater facilities as they could be used for recreation. He noted that this may be true in some instance, however, the new regulations required infiltration, and as a result, many basins won't be suitable for recreational use. He noted that TCC objects to provisions for minimum road frontage and slope of the land. He noted that

these issues could be waived on a case-by-case basis. He noted that TCC wanted to change wordage “shall” to “should”. He noted that should is the equivalent of “may” which means that those items would be removed as requirements because “should” or “may” does not require that something be done. He noted that TCC made a comment that the buffer requirement be deleted, and Mr. Stine stated that he had no response to that since he was not sure the reason for requiring the buffer from dedicated recreation land. Mr. Wolfe noted that there are instances where dedicated recreation land abuts residential units, such as Meadowbrook Park or Lamp Light Park. He noted that TCC brought up again that an appraisal should not be required and he commented that he did not see where one was required. He noted that he did not find much that needed changed as a result of TCC’s comments.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the Planning Commission would review these comments. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Planning Commission would review these items during its March meeting and report back to the Board members. He noted that once the Board receives a recommendation from the Planning Commission, he would schedule a public hearing with the Board of Supervisors. He noted that he would like to accomplish this in the first half of the year.

Continued discussion regarding a petition from Linglestown residents  
to open Raspberry Alley as a public street

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board received a petition from the Linglestown Merchants Association to open Raspberry Alley and to have the Township take ownership. He provided the Board members copies of the materials used during the Blackberry Alley takeover process, including the letter to the property owners and the Ordinance. He noted for Blackberry Alley, he and staff met with the property owners to explain the alley opening process and what would occur. He noted that this was done after a plan was developed, which entailed a survey of the property and development plan. He noted that it cost between \$7,000 and \$8,000 to complete this work. He noted that one reason for not proceeding with this project is that the Township had no funds to do the design work; however, the Township has been awarded \$250,000 in a Local Share Grant from the Pennsylvania Gaming Grant for this work.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board would have to adopt an Ordinance, one similar to the Blackberry Alley Ordinance. Mr. Hornung questioned if the Board would require the one property owner to open the alley where he has physically blocked its use by anyone else. Mr.

Wolfe noted that the decision would be up to the Board members. Mr. Seeds suggested that the Merchants Association is looking to open the alley from the First Impressions Store east to Mountain Road.

Mr. Seeds questioned if all the residents signed off for Blackberry Alley prior to it being accepted by the Township. Mr. Seeds questioned how the Merchants Association can make this request, when many do not own the land. Mr. Stine explained that anyone could petition the Board to open a street. He noted that there is no limitation in the Second Class Code as to who can make the request. He noted that the Township would prepare an ordinance, advertise it, and conduct a public hearing. Mr. Seeds noted that it is very important that this project be completed prior to the start of the main road construction. He noted that the road conditions have deteriorated with the installation of the new water line, and the new gas lines are schedule to be installed soon. He noted that Blackberry Alley needs to be paved.

Mr. Hornung noted, for Raspberry Alley, there needs to be a plan as to where the traffic would exit, as it seems that it would use the flower shop's private driveway. He noted that a consensus would be needed for this arrangement or the paving should run to the end of the alley. He questioned where the alley ends. Mr. Hawk noted that the alley ends in the Linglestown Fire Company's parking lot.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township needs to do something, and he questioned what the next step should be. Mr. Hornung noted that a traffic route should be determined. Mr. Crissman questioned where the alley ends. Mr. Wolfe explained, on paper, it is shown to Pennsylvania Avenue, emptying at the Fire Company parking lot. He noted that the alley now stops behind Mr. Minito's property, as he has blocked access on his section. Mr. Wolfe noted that there is no roadway past that area, and it would empty into wetlands, and he questioned if it was practical to run the paving past Minito's property. Mr. Hornung noted that it would dump all the traffic into businesses driveways or parking lots. Mr. Wolfe questioned if the merchants would rather have a paved facility with a satellite parking lot or the current conditions. Mr. Hornung noted that this is a questioned that needs to be addressed by the Merchants Association. Mr. Wolfe noted that Tina Robenolt, owner of First Impressions, provided the petition. Mr. Hornung suggested that she is a renter for that property. Mr. Wolfe answered that he did not know. Mr. Wolfe noted that many renters of Mr. Archibald's properties signed the petition. Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Snow and Mr. Vespignani own some of the properties near Mr. Minito's property. Mr. Hawk suggested that it

would be appropriate for Ms. Robenolt to survey the Merchants to determine what they want. Mr. Hawk noted that the Board needs to know what the businesses or the property owners want. Mr. Crissman questioned if the Merchants would be upset if other people park their vehicles in their business parking lot.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would invite the Merchants to the March 9<sup>th</sup> Workshop Meeting. Mr. Crissman noted that the topic of discussion should only be Raspberry Alley and a time allotted for the discussion. Mr. Hornung questioned if a map could be made available for the meeting. Mr. Crissman questioned if the business owners and property owners would be invited. Mr. Wolfe noted that both parties need to be invited.

Mr. Seeds noted that a one-way restriction should be made for Blackberry Alley prior to the start of the construction. Mr. Hornung noted that the one-way restriction would be changed when the construction changes in the opposite direction. He suggested that Raspberry Alley should also be marked one way from Mountain Road to Balthaser Street as well.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Blain seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle  
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman  
Township Secretary