

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop Meeting held October 12, 2010

A workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6:09 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 L. Hornung, Gary A. Crissman, and David B. Blain.

Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steven Stine, Township Solicitor; Stephen Fleming, Township Engineer, HRG, Inc.; Sam Robbins, Public Works Director; William Weaver, Authority Director; John Kerschner and George Parmer, Parmer Family Foundation; James Snyder, Snyder Secary & Associates, LLC; Dave Smith, Holy Name of Jesus Church; Ron Lucas, Stevens and Lee Lawyers and Consultants; Richard Szeles, Szeles Real Estate Development Company; Jerry Brubaker, Charter Homes; Barry Wampler and Kevin Shannon, CET Engineering, Inc.; Michael and Jean Pinci; Chief Tom Swank and President George Byerly, Colonial Park Fire Company; Chief Michael Fife, Paxtonia Fire Company; Chief William Payne, and President Ed Crum, Linglestown Fire Company; and Watson Fisher, and Ted Robertson, SWAN.

**Pledge of Allegiance**

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

**Public Comment**

No public comment was provided.

Continued discussion regarding waivers requested for the preliminary/final land development plan for Pleasant Meadows

Mr. Wolfe noted that during the last workshop meeting, after significant discussions, the Board directed the developer to address several issues which they have done, and they are here to discuss street widths, sidewalks, recreation, improvements to Locust Lane, and parking.

Mr. Jim Snyder, Snyder Secary & Associates, explained that Mr. Kerschner and Mr. Parmer are present to follow up on the requests made by the Board members at a previous meeting. He noted that he submitted additional materials to the Township showing changes made to the cartway width, sidewalks, and additional parking for the apartment building.

Mr. Snyder explained that the original request was to waive the sidewalks, then the sidewalks were move to the road cartway, and now the plans shows the construction of sidewalks on one side of the each street at the direction of the Board members. He noted that the sidewalks are also shown along Locust Lane. Mr. Crissman questioned if the area shown at the top of the plan is a walkway to access the apartment building. Mr. Snyder explained that the walkways in yellow are concrete sidewalk constructed outside of the roadway cartway. He noted that each street has a sidewalk on one side of the roadway and they all tie together. He noted that the outer loop is a pedestrian pathway that meanders through the development that would include exercise stations along the way. He noted that it was not removed in favor of the sidewalks and he is proposing both at this point. He noted that the additional sidewalks add almost a mile of new sidewalk in addition to the pedestrian pathway which is six-tenth of a mile in length. Mr. Crissman explained that he wanted to be assured that everyone would have access to a walkway in front of their home or across the street from their home to ensure a safe environment.

Mr. Snyder noted that there were some concerns about the amount of parking provided for the 60-unit apartment building. He noted that the ordinance requires one space per unit which would be 60 parking spaces, and the prior plan showed 64 parking spaces, however, the current plan has parking wrapped around the building, a porte-cochere for sheltered drop-off for residents, and some parking along Azalea Drive at two locations. He noted that the new total parking for that location is up to 86 spaces which is 40% more than required by the ordinance.

Mr. Snyder noted that there were discussions on the need for turning lanes for Locust Lane. He explained that the original plan did not provide turning lanes since this development generates very little traffic, especially in comparison to the peak volumes for Locust Lane. He noted that the heavy movements are the left and right turns associated with the Dauphin County Technical School (DCTS). He noted that Mr. Parmer evaluated the entire project and decided that he would be willing to construct a left turn lane into the site and a left turn into the DCTS site which requires road widening and improvements to the turning lanes, as well as the bay tapers and the transition tapers. He noted that the road changes go well beyond the property

boundaries to the west and to the east. He noted that he is trying to hold the curb line, building from the south to the north, and this requires a one or two foot shift from the centerline, which will prevent the removal of sidewalks, curbs, and utilities, etc on the north side of the road that were recently improved. He noted that this is all conditioned on the northwest side of the property where no sidewalks were planned, noting that it would require grading and an easement from the adjacent property owner. He noted that the one taper would required an agreement of release from PENNDOT permitting process and he noted that he would hope to be able to get those to implement the design. He noted if he is unable to get the easements, he may have to come to the Township to ask for assistance along those lines or he will have to change the scope of work. Mr. Hawk noted that would be in regard to the easement. Mr. Snyder answered yes. He explained when you build turning lanes, PENNDOT requires leases from the adjacent property owners to the tapers. He noted that the school and church will be affected. He noted to implement the design there are things that go outside of his control and Mr. Parmer is proposing to take it on. Mr. Crissman noted that it makes sense to put the turning lanes in, but before he is willing to support it he would like Mr. Snyder to get a response back from the School District since their buses would need to access the proposed changes in lanes in the morning and evening. He noted that he would like the School District to be made aware of the situation and ensure that they are supportive of it. Mr. Snyder answered that he will do that.

Mr. Crissman questioned with the reduction of road cartway would there be a sufficient amount of parking on the street for visitors and room to drive by in a safe environment. Mr. Snyder answered yes. He explained that he moved the pedestrian sidewalk outside of the road cartway behind the curb and grass strip, reduced the cartway to 26 feet, which allows for parking on one side, noting that it would provide for approximately 100 vehicles to be parked on the street. He noted that each unit would be provided with two off-street parking spaces, which is an ordinance requirement. He noted that these are the major design changes made since the last meeting.

Mr. Crissman noted that the sidewalk only goes partway around the cul-de-sac and he would prefer if the sidewalk was extended past the next three houses in the cul-de-sac.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the cartway width would require a waiver from the Board. Mr. Crissman stated that he thought it was in compliance. Mr. Wolfe noted that 26 feet is not in

compliance, and the plan would still need a waiver. Mr. Snyder noted that he is requesting a waiver for the slant curb, the cartway width, and sidewalk on one side versus both sides.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the proposal from the developer is to provide an easement for the establishment of a greenway which would be in compliance with the Township's Greenway Plan. He noted that Mr. Luetchford has reviewed the easement and he had no concerns for the Greenway Plan, however, the recreational land dedication would require approximately seven acres, and the land dedication amounts to a little more than an acre of land. He noted that further discussion is needed on this topic with the developer. Mr. Snyder noted, at the last meeting the recreation issue was a three prong issue. He noted that the plan provides substantial amount of on-site recreation for the residents. He noted that Mr. Seeds suggested the some consideration may be made for the roadway improvements and he noted that would be in addition to the dedication of land along Nyes Road as part of the Greenway. He suggested that the recreation component would include the roadway improvements, greenway contribution, and on-site recreation facilities.

Mr. Kerschner noted that the sewer easement that Mr. Luetchford mentioned in his memo is a swamp and very wet. He explained that the Parmer Foundation has ground beyond that area on Nyes Road, on the north side of the property that is higher and dryer and more conducive to a walking trail and it would be less work to build it in that location. He noted that it connects with ground that the Township owns where the pump station use to be. He noted if you want to keep the existing easement, that is fine with him, or he could dedicate an area outside the wetlands.

Mr. Wolfe noted that staff's recommendation is that the Board does not have complete compliance with the ordinance and it then becomes the Board's decision.

Mr. Hawk questioned if there was a dollar figure for the land. Mr. Wolfe noted that the guideline is not in dollars for the dedication of land, it would be the map that Mr. Luetchford provided. Mr. Blain noted that the requirement is 20% of the 36 acres amounting to 7 acres or the fee in lieu of \$2300 per unit for 150 units. He noted that it would amount to \$345,000. He noted at the last meeting an analysis of the total cost of improvements for recreation was provided by the developer estimated at \$401,075.00 to include the land. He noted that the use of the recreational improvements is for the residents only and not public. He noted that the recreation fee in lieu provides for public recreation.

Mr. Crissman noted that he would like to speak to the waivers; for the cartway, sidewalks on one side of the street, and recreation fee in lieu usage. Mr. Snyder noted that great strides have been made in the plan to meet the concerns of the Township. Mr. Hawk questioned Mr. Snyder if extending the sidewalk around the other three homes in the cul-de-sac would be an issue. Mr. Snyder answered that it could be added to the map. Mr. Blain questioned how much additional investment would be put in for the one mile of sidewalk as well the land on Nyes Road, additional parking at the apartment unit, and the construction of turning lanes on Locust Lane. Mr. Snyder noted that he did not run the numbers but he suggested that it would be close to \$150,000. He noted that a mile of sidewalk is a big ticket item, the improvements to Locust Lane are a large item, and so is the dedication of land. Mr. Blain questioned how many units are in the plan. Mr. Snyder noted that there are 90 single family cottages and 60 apartments for a total of 150 units.

Mr. Crissman suggested reviewing the three options to see what the objections are. Mr. Hawk noted that he is pleased with the sidewalks. Mr. Crissman noted that he is pleased that the developer moved the sidewalks away from the cartway and created it as a separate entity. He noted that there is the ability to park a car in the cartway to allow for visitors as well as a sufficient driving lane. He noted that they have accommodated sidewalk to the end of the property along Locust Lane to the west. Mr. Hawk questioned what the width of a car is. Mr. Snyder answered that the physical width is six and a half feet, but parking spaces are nine feet wide. He noted if you look at the diagram in terms of a cartway, you can pass a car that is parked and an emergency vehicle can also pass parked cars. He suggested that the cartway is sufficient noting that you do not want huge cartways in this development, noting that the structures are closer to the street, producing slower speeds. Mr. Hawk noted that a smaller cartway keeps the speeds down. Mr. Snyder agreed.

Mr. Crissman noted that there is added parking in front of the apartment building to provide for visitors, and they have also provided the insert area on either side of the building and now there is parking for 85 vehicles as opposed to 65. He noted that those concerns have been addressed as well.

Mr. Blain questioned what the street width was for the Amesbury Development. Mr. Wolfe answered that it was 30 feet, with sidewalks on one side of the street. Mr. Hawk noted that he is okay with the trade off for the turning lanes. Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Snyder what the

estimated costs are for the turning lanes. Mr. Snyder noted that a contractor looked at it and priced it at \$132,000 for all the improvements that are shown. Mr. Blain questioned if that included the curbing and sidewalks. Mr. Kerschner answered yes. Mr. Snyder noted that the internal sidewalks would not be included in that number. Mr. Hornung questioned what the costs would be to install the turning lanes on Locust Lane and not the sidewalks along Locust Lane. Mr. Kerschner answered that he did not know because he did not know what has to be done, but based upon the estimates it would be \$90,000. He noted that he has not spoken with PENNDOT yet. He noted that there is a sub-surface gas monitoring system in the right-of-way but outside the cartway. He noted that it was there first and it would have to be moved. He noted if you drive by you will see vapors coming out, and explained that it was installed for the gas pipeline. Mr. Blain noted that it would cost \$132,000 to install sidewalks along Locust Lane and the turning lanes. He noted that it would only be \$18,000 for the remaining internal sidewalks, and the extra paving for the parking. Mr. Snyder suggested that it might be a little low, noting that it might be more like \$50,000 to \$60,000 to construct all the internal sidewalks. He noted that it does not include the dedication of land along the Nyes Run tributary. Mr. Hawk questioned if Mr. Snyder mentioned \$500,000 in costs. Mr. Snyder noted that the total amount of recreation that the applicant is willing to install for the residents was over \$300,000, and adding the allocated land it would be more like \$400,000, in addition to another \$100,000 for off-site improvements. Mr. Wolfe noted that the recreation fee in lieu for this plan is \$2300 per 150 units. Mr. Blain noted that it would amount to \$345,000.

Mr. Crissman questioned if there is a problem for construction since the gas is being vented in that location. Mr. Snyder answered no and explained that an underground gas line runs parallel to Locust Lane on that side of the street. He noted that it is an 8 inch line and UGI pays for the monitoring station. Mr. Crissman questioned if it would have any impact on the construction or the development. Mr. Snyder noted that UGI will have to move it, and it would be very similar to moving a utility pole.

Mr. Blain questioned what the value would be for the land that you proposed to contribute along the stream. Mr. Kerschner suggested that it would be worth \$50,000, using \$40,000 as the raw price per acre. Mr. Blain noted with \$50,000 added to the \$200,000, he questioned how the developer proposes to keep the units affordable or the prices in a certain price range with additional costs of \$250,000. He questioned if you would be passing the

additional prices on to the homeowners. Mr. Kerschner noted that the goal is to make the units as affordable as practical, and it is out of their control. He noted that some of the costs will be passed on; others may be absorbed by the Foundation.

Mr. Hawk questioned what the projected price would be for a cottage unit. Mr. Kerschner answered that it would be between \$120,000 and \$150,000.

Mr. Hornung noted that the fee in lieu is \$345,000 and if you subtract the value of the land along Nyes Road at \$50,000 then it is down to \$295,000. He noted that the turning lanes should be worth something as it is an off-site improvement that is not required, so subtract \$100,000 for those improvements and you are at \$195,000. He noted that there are on-site facilities that they are providing for the residents who are Township residents and they are tailored for the age of the persons moving into the properties. He noted that something should be factored in for that and what is left over would be the contribution. He questioned what the on-site recreation credit should be. He asked what would be the difference if a single family development was built and they built a baseball field. He noted that although it would be public, they are still providing recreation for the residents. Mr. Hawk noted that you don't want to see a significant amount of extras passed on to the residents when you price the homes between \$125,000 to \$140,000 as it might make the cost too prohibitive for residents who want to move to this development.

Mr. Hornung noted in an effort to save costs, it would make sense to make the homes more affordable by compressing them into duplexes or quads. He noted that the people that you are looking to put into these unit like living in that type of environment as compared to single homes. He noted that it would cut back on the cost of the unit because there would be common walls, that would need to be fire rated, and it would also provide a decrease in the heating bills unless a person owns an end unit. He questioned, if the developer is looking to save costs, why not cut back in the building design area to make up for the amenities that you want to put in. Mr. Snyder noted that the plan is restricted by zoning, and in order to allow this development to proceed, he had to obtain a variance under the ordinance. He noted that the plan is capped at 150 units, and not permitted to add more density on this site to absorb the costs, so the costs are the costs and the numbers of units are the units. He explained that he understood the concept of efficiencies in the unit design but there is a zoning issue that he would not be able to get past. Mr. Parmer noted after the first of the year he will have to install sprinklers in the cottages in

every unit and that will cost money as well. He noted that he is fighting costs, and every time he looks around the costs increase. He noted that the affordability is starting to wane. Mr. Snyder noted that they are putting in \$400,000 worth of improvements with the walking trails, community gardens, lower level of the building, and all those costs are real, and he would have to increase the costs to be able to build the recreational facilities that they normally would not have.

Mr. Crissman noted that the developer must have a number for consideration for a fee in lieu for the Board to consider. Mr. Snyder noted that the proposal is the proposal, and since the last time the developer met with the Board, he has added a lot of investments in roadway improvements, sidewalks, additional land dedication, and tried to close the gap. He noted that those are real costs for real dollars. Mr. Crissman questioned what proposal he could present to the Board based on the prior discussions held. Mr. Parmer noted that the only thing he could do is to take out some of the planned amenities in the development, but it would be defeating the purpose, noting if you take the exercise room, then those people might have to go to the Friendship Center and now there is more traffic. He noted that he is trying to keep the residents on site, to keep them from going out onto the highways.

Mr. Blain questioned what the cost of the internal recreation amenities proposed is. Mr. Snyder answered that it was \$400,000. Mr. Wolfe noted that the amount that you reviewed was \$418,000. Mr. Blain questioned if that included equipment inside the building. He questioned what the costs for the external items, such as the walking trail, fitness stations, and other things were. Mr. Kerschner suggested that one of their units with one or two occupants does not equal a unit for a single family home with 4.3 occupants. He noted that he is getting charged the same recreation fee and it is not apples for apples. He noted that he has mentioned that it is not an equitable situation. He noted that it might be better to use a ratio of the 150 units instead of the one-for-one value. He noted in lieu of the recreation fee, they have come up with the added improvements. Mr. Crissman questioned if there is amount of funds that the Parmer Foundation would want to make for consideration. Mr. Kerschner answered that they do not have one. He noted that the proposal is before the Board and they feel that they have met the requirements.

Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Hornung noted that the fee in lieu is \$345,000 and they should receive credit for turning lanes at \$90,000 and \$50,000 for the land along Nyes Road, and that there should be some credit for the amenities that they have planned. Mr. Crissman noted that

since there is agreement on the sidewalks and cartways, and road improvements, he would like to see some movement on Mr. Parmer's side to make this happen. Mr. Parmer questioned Mr. Crissman if the Board wants him to start striping items from the project. Mr. Crissman answered no, noting that he thought that they were down to a dollar amount. He noted if that is what Mr. Parmer's bottom line is then the Board would need to make a decision on that. Mr. Parmer noted that he could strip out some of the recreational items internally. Mr. Crissman noted that he does not want Mr. Parmer to do anything differently from what he is planning, noting that there is a consensus on most of the items, with the remaining issue being the fee in lieu. He noted that is the issue in order for this project to move forward.

Mr. Blain noted that he agreed with providing credit for the turning lane and the land as well, and he thinks that some credit should be given for the internal improvements. He noted if you add the costs of the pedestrian path at \$52,000 and \$15,000 for the wellness stations and \$32,000 for the landscaping, noting that was the only items that he was looking at, it would be consider like a normal development giving land to the Township for some type of park system, the only difference is that it is contained to an internal development. He noted that it is not open to the public for public use, but he felt that a percentage of that total amount should be given credit. He suggested that credit be given for 50% of the total number resulting in a \$50,000 credit. He noted that he has almost reconciled the fee in lieu of \$345,000, with a difference of \$100,000. Mr. Hornung noted that is where he is with his calculation. Mr. Hornung noted that the fee is lieu would be \$100,000, resulting in a cost of \$670 per unit. Mr. Hawk noted that he is in the same ball park for a figure as Mr. Hornung and Mr. Blain.

Mr. Parmer questioned if the recreation fee is the same for all types of units in the Township. Mr. Hawk noted that is the fee for all units. Mr. Parmer questioned if this is something that can be looked at down the road. Mr. Hawk noted that it would not be done tonight. Mr. Crissman suggested that this is part of what the discussion is about. He noted that they are trying to reduce the amount and still have what the Board believes to be a fair and equitable amount.

Mr. Hawk noted that the ordinance states that the recreation fee is \$2,300 per unit, but he is trying to give credit for the things that Mr. Parmer has proposed, and the Board appreciates the fact that Mr. Parmer is willing to do this, but at the same time the Board cannot walk away from the principals established in the ordinance. He noted that the Board is granting a waiver on the

cartway, consideration in regard to the sidewalk, and other improvements, but there is still about \$100,000 difference after the credit has been provided. Mr. Parmer noted that he could remove \$100,000 of the improvements. Mr. Kerschner noted that no credit was given for the items on the bottom half of the list. Mr. Blain noted that it does not make sense to give credit for an indoor exercise facility. Mr. Kerschner noted if that is the case then he should be able to remove those items from the plan and use that money to pay for the \$100,000 he owns for the recreation fee. Mr. Blain noted that it would be the choice of the developer to do that. Mr. Kerschner questioned if Mr. Parmer could do this. Mr. Hornung noted if you are not getting credit for it, then you should be able to do with it what you want. He noted that the ordinance does not mandate the developer to provide it. Mr. Crissman noted that it would be unfortunate for the perspective buyer. Mr. Parmer agreed. Mr. Crissman noted that it would appeal to him if he was looking to buy at that location. Mr. Parmer noted that he is trying to make it affordable. Mr. Crissman noted that the Board is trying to make its decisions in the best interest of the community. Mr. Parmer noted that it is a non-profit plan, and not created to make money.

Mr. Blain noted in the initial plan, there were no sidewalks to the west along Locust Lane. Mr. Kerschner noted, from the last meeting he was told that there was no support for that waiver, so he added curb and sidewalk. Mr. Blain noted that he never said he was in favor of that requirement, only for the internal sidewalks. He noted that it did not make sense to him due to the slope in that location. He questioned, if the plan requested a waiver from the sidewalk westbound from the entrance, how much would the plan save. Mr. Kerschner noted that there was a clear consensus from the Board that the curb and sidewalk waiver for Locust Lane would not be supported, so he revised that plan and is no longer asking for that waiver. Mr. Hornung noted that the Board member who was pushing that item is not present tonight.

Mr. Hawk noted that the only item to resolve is the fee in lieu. Mr. Hornung noted if the Board requires a donation of \$100,000 then Mr. Parmer will cut back on some of the exercise equipment internal to the apartment building. Mr. Hornung questioned what would it take to keep that equipment in the plan. Mr. Hornung questioned if the land would keep the exercise room in the plan. He noted that he did not know how much the land is worth to the Township. Mr. Parmer noted that he would have to remove that part of the facility to make it happen as everything is going up in price and he would hate to do it. He noted that he is trying to keep the price down. Mr. Hornung noted that he could request another variance from the Zoning Hearing

Board to build quads in place of single family cottages. He noted if they would permit the developer to keep the total number of units at 150, but build quads or duplexes it would reduce the overall costs. Mr. Parmer noted that he would incur the price of re-engineering the entire project, which is expensive. Mr. Hornung explained that he feels the appeal for that age group would not be single-family dwellings. Mr. Parmer explained that the people he has talked to are widows who live in large homes and would like to move to a small bungalow and it would be appealing to them. Mr. Crissman noted that it is very similar to Messiah Village. Mr. Parmer noted by keeping the facilities on site for that age group, it would be a pleasant experience for them.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he and Mr. Fleming were discussing the issue and he suggested that there is a way that the developer could save some money that could be applied to the donation for the recreational use. He noted that the current cartway width of 26 feet will require a waiver, however, there is a potential to reduce the cartway width further without requiring a waiver by making the streets one-way. He noted that it would hold true for all streets except for the cul-de-sac, noting that the plan would work with all vehicles traveling in a one-way direction. Mr. Blain questioned if the only two-way street would be the entrance street, back to the cul-de-sac. Mr. Wolfe suggested that the one block entrance and cul-de-sac would be two-ways with all other streets being one-way. He noted that it would decrease the street costs by 25% to 30%, however, it might not get you close to the \$100,000 fee. Mr. Hornung noted that there are advantages for one-way streets for older drivers. Mr. Wolfe suggested that the one way pattern could be north for Primrose Place, turning right onto Azelea Drive which would loop around to Marigold Lane and back out. He noted that Larkspur could be one way to the east and the Daffodil Court could be one way to the north and east. Mr. Kerschner noted that he could re-design the road pattern to make it work.

Mr. Snyder noted that the proposal would be one-way streets which would save paving, and a \$100,000 contribution to the fee-in-lieu would resolve the issue. Mr. Crissman noted that it would maintain the current plan for recreational facilities for the site. Mr. Snyder noted that the fee-in-lieu would be divided by the total number of units and be paid at the time of construction. Mr. Wolfe questioned Mr. Snyder what he would propose for a one-way width road cartway. Mr. Snyder suggested in the neighborhood of 20 feet or 22 feet, allowing for the parallel parking. Mr. Fleming noted that when you waive parking on one side, the roadway would be 30 feet with a

two-way lane, noting that they were proposing 26 foot cartway. He noted that now there would be a one-way cartway with parking on one side of the street, and they are proposing a 22-foot cartway allowing for a 12-foot driving lane. Mr. Crissman questioned what impact would that have for emergency vehicles. Mr. Snyder noted that there would be a clear lane for their travel. Mr. Crissman noted that he wants to be assured of enough of a travel lane for emergency vehicles. He noted that you do not need to worry about school buses. Mr. Snyder noted that he would have to run the turning templates for the street. Mr. Fleming noting the 26-foot width proposed would work for a one-way circulation, but going narrower than that is pushing it from a traffic standpoint. Mr. Blain noted that it doesn't make any sense to have them change the traffic pattern and not be able to reduce the cartway width. Mr. Snyder noted that a 26-foot width is more than sufficient for two-way passage, now the plan only needs one way. He noted if you have 15 feet with a seven foot parking lane, it would amount to 22 feet. He noted that a standard traffic lane is 12 feet wide, and he needs to be in the 21 to 22 foot area to make it work. Mr. Hornung suggested that the 22 foot lane is the lowest he would want to go. Mr. Blain noted that you are giving him a 12 foot travel lane at ten feet for parking. He questioned Mr. Fleming where he came up with his number as he thought the 22 foot lane would work. Mr. Fleming noted that the ordinance allows for one way circulation in a parking lot and requires a width of 18 feet. He noted that you would have parking outside of that lane, and that you should maintain the 18 feet to allow vehicles to back out of their driveways. Mr. Snyder noted that requirement was predicated on having room for a vehicle to back out of a parking space and be able to turn out of it. Mr. Wolfe noted for emergency vehicles the slant curb is not problematic for them. Mr. Hornung noted that people tend to park closer to the slant curb, and in some instances they may park up to a foot from the curb. He noted that if you have an eight foot wide car, you have to have room for them to open their car door, so he would add another two foot for that. He noted that you are really looking at 12 feet to drive, and he stated that it must be at least 22 feet wide.

Mr. Wolfe questioned Mr. Snyder if he planned to revise the plan, having staff come up with a memorandum in order for the plan to be ready for the first Board meeting in November. Mr. Snyder explained that Mr. Parmer wanted direction in how to proceed with the plan, and does not want to go back and forth with numerous revisions. Mr. Wolfe noted if the plan is not submitted by November 1, 2010, it will need an extension.

Continued discussion regarding proposed BC-1A stormsewer system improvements

Mr. Sam Robbins, Public Works Director, noted that he discussed the stormsewer improvements in BC-1A last month as it relates to the rear of Mr. Pinci's property, and the four properties located to the rear of his property that abut Elmer Avenue. He noted that the layout was discussed and the possibility of securing easements and it is his understanding that Jean and Mike Pinci had come to a public meeting to discuss issues relative to an easement. He noted that he would like to afford Mr. and Mrs. Pinci an opportunity to voice their concerns regarding the proposed easement.

Mr. Mike Pinci, 6267 Linglestown Road, noted that he was asked by the Board members to bring documentation showing the historic spring on his property. He distributed copies of 24 deed chain links to William Penn and King George III. He noted that the Eagle Hotel was on the property and was moved to higher ground in 1858. He noted that page five will show that the spring is on the said premises.

Mr. Pinci noted that Document 1 shows the Pinci property with the spring house location which is close to the easement. He noted that the 20 foot wide easement would engulf and continue to have the water flow to that location of the spring. He suggested that the easement is in the 20 foot area of the spring. He noted that the person who owned the property was Nevin Moyer and his wife was Sarah. He noted that Document 2 is the transfer tax to the person he bought the property from, Beatrice Lewis showing that it was transferred to him and that he has current ownership of the property. He noted that Document 3 is the contract between Beatrice Lewis, the person he bought the ground from in 1986. He noted that it does not mention anything about the historic value, but the key is the description of the ground and the description of the spring. He noted that Document 4 shows the historic spring on said premises and the historical data connected to this property. He noted that Document 5 shows the information on the famous Battalion Drill Ground at Linglestown. He noted that the Township's almanac from Linglestown shows the Running Pump Tavern, which was the Eagle Hotel, and was located on part of the Nevin Moyer farm. He noted after that, the spring was not used in the above manner and it became the property of the person who owns the ground around it. He noted that is Document 5. He noted that it mentions the water rights, it mentions the 36-foot pine logs that were penciled in with lead, and he noted that it went from his property to Fort Hunter and had one branch leading to Harrisburg water and Fort Hunter water. He noted that the Township's almanac mentions that

the four churches, schools and mission that were formed on this farm, the first farm east of Linglestown by Nevin Moyer. He noted that Nevin Moyer is Bill Minsker's uncle. He noted that Document 6 shows Nevin Moyer, Justice of the Peace in 1932 buying the ground from George Unger to Ezra Care. He noted that these pages show where the four churches share the spring; and that the Berryhill's are buried in unmarked graves along with family members on the property; and the Presbyterian Church and school and mission are 100 feet away from the spring. He noted that it also mentions that the Wenrich's were the owners at one time, and they gave  $2\frac{3}{4}$  acres for church and school purposes. He noted that no church will interfere with each other in going back and forth to the spring from the church and school. He noted that Document 7 is very confidential to him and he did not include it as he is using to for part of his book. He explained that Document 7 contains five pages of George Washington's conversation from Friday, October 3, 1774, when he met Alexander Berryhill. He noted that the conversation mentions the four churches, the school, and mission, the Eagle Hotel moving to higher ground, that Alexander Berryhill was the first person to come to Harrisburg, that he was the first resident of Harrisburg and that he also formed a church in Harrisburg. He noted that it mentions the Linglestown Battalion Drill Ground and that it is located on this farm, as well as the Underground Railroad and Frances Wenrich and Colonel John Umburger in 1725, the Presbyterians established a school and mission, and in 1791 the congregations were organized on this farm.

Mr. Hornung questioned what Mr. Pinci was trying to prove. Mr. Pinci answered that he has historic value on his property and that the easements should not encroach the historic spring. Mr. Hornung questioned where did Mr. Pinci proposed to move the easement to. Mr. Pinci answered that he is not an engineer. Mrs. Pinci stated that it should be piped across the street. Mr. Hornung answered that the Township is not going to do that. Ms. Pinci questioned why the Township cannot do that. Mr. Robbins answered that PENNDOT will not allow the Township to do that. Mr. Pinci noted that he does not mind the Township taking the ground, but they do have a problem with flooding. He noted that he does not want the Township to take the spring and put it in an easement. He questioned if the problem could be solved through another means.

Mr. Pinci noted that Document 22 is the plot plan for Linglestown. He noted that Thomas and Mary Lingle formed the town in 1765. He noted that the magistrate was Alexander Berryhill. He noted that he got the deed from Nevin Moyer's dad and that is significant to who owned the property before.

Mr. Robbins noted that when he met with the Pinci's he explained that he did not believe that the water from the south does not currently go to the house, noting that he is not changing or adding anything. He noted that all he is doing is piping the water... Mr. Pinci noted that the water will run to the highway and accumulate there. Mr. Robbins responded that it has run that way.... Mrs. Pinci stated not in an 18 inch pipe. Mr. Robbins noted that the water flow would not change, noting that the water has run under the Pinci's slues for years and all he wants to do is to discharge the water and reestablish the swale. He noted that what he wants to do will not impact the historic site.

Mr. Pinci noted if he would bring in a well driller and he would see the easement, he won't go near it. He explained that he would like to extract the water for commercial purposes. He suggested if the spring was in the easement it would tie him up and he could never drill where the spring is at. Mr. Stine questioned why you would want to drill a well in an historic spot. Mr. Pinci noted that Document 14 has information on the Bellefonte spring that is a historic spring and what it is making.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Pinci does not want the Township to disturb the land but he is willing to disturb it to extract water. Mr. Pinci noted that is what William Penn founded America on, the basic beneficial enjoyment of your property. He noted if you discovered gold on your property you would have the right to extract that gold and sell it. That is your basic right as an American citizen to whatever your ground is deemed to be profitable. Mr. Hawk questioned what the answer is to Mr. Blain's question for why the Township can't put the easement through their land and still do the drilling. Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Pinci is stating, if the easement is put in and he wanted to extract the water from his property that a well driller would not drill since there is an easement in the area. Mr. Stine noted that the easement could be structured to provide Mr. Pinci to right to drill. Mr. Hornung questioned if the easement could be moved more to the east. Mr. Pinci answered yes. Ms. Pinci noted that they have a garage in that area. Mr. Pinci noted that he would not care how close it came to the garage. Mr. Robbins questioned if Mr. Pinci has a definitive location as to where the spring is. Mr. Pinci answered yes. Mr. Robbins noted that when he met with Mr. Pinci, he did not know if the site was in the easement. Mr. Pinci noted that Mr. Robbins proposed that the pipe would be so many feet from the highway and the disbursement of the water would go into the swale of the spring. Mr. Robbins noted that this would be a defined channel; he noted that once the water comes out of the pipe, it would not run

willy-nilly. He noted that is why he wants to reestablish the swale and keep the water in it. Mr. Pinci noted that it is his concern that the shady area not be engulfed in the area of his spring. Mr. Robbins noted that is not an issue and he mentioned that to Mr. Pinci when he met with him. He noted that it would be a very defined channel for water to run. Mr. Hornung noted that it could be written in the easement that he could drill a well anywhere he wants. Mr. Pinci noted that it would be awesome since it would not prohibit him from future endeavors.

Mr. Hawk requested Mr. Robbins to recap the plan. Mr. Robbins explained that the two pipes that come from the houses on Elmer Avenue would be combined and he would set an inlet box and pipe the water across the back of the Mader and Shade property and set another inlet, and discharge the water into the Pinci property. Mr. Hornung questioned why Mr. Robbins would not extend the pipe further down. Mr. Robbins noted that the angle will not work for piping. Mr. Hornung questioned what would happen if you tilted it and cut off the corner and put a 122/73 to round off the corner, and then direct it to the stone to do 90 degree. Mr. Robbins noted that he does not have a lot of room to go a considerable distance in that direction as the Pinci's have things on their property such as an elevated bank. Mr. Hornung suggested that he could run the pipe down and direct it to another area. Mr. Robbins answered that he could. Mr. Shannon noted that there is an existing swale that runs in that area north of Mader's. Ms. Pinci noted that it needs to be filled in. She questioned why you would keep that swale there if they are trying to rectify the problem. Mr. Pinci explained that the swale was caused by erosion. Ms. Pinci noted that it was never that deep when they moved in. Mr. Robbins questioned who put the swale in. Mr. Pinci answered that the Township did. Ms. Pinci noted that Glen Farling installed the swale. Mr. Weaver noted that the Township could not fill in the swale without an easement and suggested that it could get a temporary easement to fill it in. Mr. Robbins noted that he would have to get someone from Dauphin County to establish whether it is possible to do this. Mr. Shannon suggested that it is a delineated wetland in the area. He questioned if you take the water away from the wetlands if it continues to be a wetlands. Ms. Pinci questioned why it was wetlands. Mr. Robbins noted that wetlands can be created for lack of maintenance. Mrs. Pinci stated, there you go, 23 years that you guys didn't fix it. Mr. Hornung noted to Ms. Pinci that the Township could not fix it on her land. Mr. Robbins noted that the Township has no legal right to do anything and that is the whole crux of the problem. He noted if he had an easement to reconstitute the swale we wouldn't be here. Mr. Pinci noted yet you want an easement to let that

water come over and trespass and cause contamination and erosion. Mr. Robbins noted that it was his understanding that when this pipe was extended, the Township came to you for an easement. Mrs. Pinci stated to put it around our house.

Mr. Weaver questioned Mr. Shannon if the Authority got a permit for that discharge. Mr. Shannon stated that it was not needed. He noted that the water is already discharging from Mr. Metka's property. Mr. Shannon noted that all the project does is to extend the discharge further to the west and put it into an existing swale where it goes now. He noted where they are discharging is not a wetland, but to the right of it on the Pinci' property it is a wetland. Mr. Hornung questioned how much of the land is designated wetland, and who designated it wetlands. Mr. Shannon answered that CET designated it as a wetland, and that it was done as part of the stormsewer work that was done as an addendum to the sewer project. Mr. Weaver questioned who would we have to contact to get permission to fill it in. Mr. Shannon noted that Mr. Robbins made contact with DEP to have them come out and discuss the issue. Mr. Robbins explained that he did not get to that point as Mr. and Mrs. Pinci refused to meet.

Mr. Metka questioned if the swale between the properties affects the Pinci's property. Mr. Pinci answered yes. Mr. Metka noted if there was normal vegetation allowed to grow in that area it would not be a problem but you have placed a blue tarp that allows the water to run down into the swale. Mrs. Pinci stated that it does not matter as the water still erodes the area. She noted that she planted trees there and they died. Mr. Metka noted when he spoke to the Board members last month; he explained that the property behind his fence is so damp and muddy that it is almost the end of June before he can cut his grass. He noted that he has had a constant water problem for 22 years. Mr. Pinci questioned where the water was coming from. Mr. Metka noted that the water is coming from up in the development. Mr. Pinci noted that it is not the Pinci water. Mr. Metka stated that he never said it was. Mr. Pinci questioned why the tarp was causing a problem. Mr. Metka answered if there was vegetation in place of blue tarp it would be better. Mr. Hawk called the room to order.

Mr. Hornung noted that he had no problem in trying to preserve the well for Mr. Pinci but since we are discussing the issue of the swale, he noted that it will take two things, a temporary easement to be determined after a meeting with DEP to figure out how to fix the problem while the Township has the equipment in the area to do other work, and he noted that he does not know how much of an easement is necessary since it would be up to Mr. Robbins and the Township to

determine. He noted that it would result in a cooperative effort. He noted once the project is done, the easement would go away so Mr. Pinci would have his property with no easement on the side where the swale is located. He noted until someone from DEP looks at the site and the engineer looks at it and then they can come up with a solution but this will only work if the Pinci's are willing to cooperate. He noted that there are some wetlands in the area, and it would entail working with DEP on an agreement that once the wetlands are dry, they would go away. He assumed if DEP is reasonable they should allow the Township to go in and fill it in. He noted with a 3<sup>rd</sup> party involved it is hard to say what the outcome will be. He noted that there is also the issue of how much it will cost to do the work. Mrs. Pinci noted that she does not want the swale filled in completely as she needs it since the people behind her, who have pools, drain their pools therefore they need some type of swale in the area.

A question was asked why so much debris was put in the swale area, as there is no way for the water to flow. Mr. Pinci noted that it is three foot wide.... The woman noted that there are 20 foot long plastic pipes that have nothing to do with it and she stated that her yard has gotten progressively wetter since... Mr. Hawk called the meeting to order and requested Ms. Pinci to allow the woman to finish her comments. She noted that her property has gotten progressively wetter and the Pinci's continue to put things in the current swale to act as obstructions, so that the water can't flow and her property is a mess. Mr. Pinci noted that the water is backing up and causing a problem. She noted that the Pinci's are not allowing the water to flow away from their properties. Mr. Pinci noted that no matter what he puts in that area, the water is going to wash it out, noting that erosion has become an issue.

Mr. Hornung noted what the Township wants to do would solve the problem. Ms. Pinci questioned what happens if it doesn't. Mr. Hornung answered that the Township would have to take another look at it as there may be other reasons for it not working. He noted that areas that have springs tend to have problems. Mr. Pinci questioned the neighbor if she was putting a lot of brush in the area, or a tree. The woman answered that the tree fell. Mr. Hawk noted that it is time to stop the back and forth conversation and time to find a solution. A woman noted that the plan called for an alley to be located behind the homes. Mr. Pinci noted that it was Blackberry Alley. Mr. Pinci noted that it was a 30 foot alley and he would own 15 feet and the neighbor would own 15 feet. The woman noted that Mr. Pinci keeps piling more stuff on their side of the alley.

Mr. Crissman noted that only one person should speak at a time. Mr. Metka noted 15 years ago the outfall was installed and the water has been coming out of the pipes for the past six or seven years and the plan at that time was to take the pipe out to Linglestown Road and drain it properly but the access was never given to cross the Pinci's property. Mr. Metka noted that he continues to be in the same situation, and he questioned why the Pinci's have never mentioned that they have a historic site, especially when the house was built or when improvements were made to the property. He questioned why it is an issue now when it is something that affects the Township and everyone present. Mr. Pinci stated that there were too many assumptions. Mr. Hornung noted that the question is a mute point since the Township has come up with a way to resolve the problem that will mitigate the water issue. He suggested that going back into history will not solve anything at this point, and that the process needs to move forward. He noted if Mr. Metka is unhappy with what the Township is going to do then we need to discuss that, but as to asking Mr. Pinci this or that, it will not resolve the issue. Mr. Pinci questioned why it is an issue now when the Township wants to move forward with correcting a problem. Mr. Hornung noted that is not his concern, but his concern is with his land. Mr. Metka noted that it is his concern since he and his neighbors have the water problem. Mr. Hornung noted that the Township is solving the water problem. Mr. Hornung noted that if it is caused by Mr. Pinci's land and if the Township can mitigate where Mr. Pinci wants the water to go as long as the water cross over his land, noting that the he has made a determination that it will be put in one way or the other, now it is a problem of coming together to develop a solution for all of the property owners. He noted if the Township was coming on Mr. Metka's property it would provide him the same consideration, asking where to put it to accommodate what the Township needs to do. He noted that when the Township goes on a persons land it tries to accommodate them as much as possible and still obtain the ultimate goal. He noted that the Township will try to mitigate Mr. Pinci's concern for his well. He explained that he is trying to be a good steward of everyone's property.

Mr. Robbins noted that he will set up an appointment with Dauphin County Conservation District to meet as a first step. He noted that he will get the drawings modified and be back in contact with the Pinci's. Mrs. Pinci questioned if the Township is taking easements on the front trench. Mr. Robbins noted that is part of what the Township is asking for. Ms. Pinci noted that is a lot of easement to be put on her deed. Mr. Robbins noted that you can't lose sight that the

Township is trying to correct a problem. Mr. Hornung requested Mr. Robbins to keep the easement as narrow as possible.

Continued discussion regarding engineer's comments applicable to the preliminary/final land development plan for the Holy Name of Jesus Church

Mr. Wolfe noted in regard to general condition 5, it was found not to be applicable and will be removed from the final memorandum. He noted that the discussion moved to the engineer's comments and there were 19 comments with most being insignificant. He noted that comment 5 was determined, during the last meeting, not to be applicable in that the Township does not have the ability to demand off-sight improvements. He noted that there were three significant issues that needed to be addressed, the first is the delineation of the clear sight triangle at all connecting points, showing the connecting points to public streets. He noted that this is a land development plan, but staff wants to know how the land development plan connects tot the public streets system and that the connections are safe. He noted that there is an issue regarding the banks of the detention pond and whether or not the Board would desire a fence around the pond. He noted that there is an issue in regards to a highway occupancy permit (HOP) which is comment number eight. He noted that even though the plan does not show any improvements to the public transportation system, PENNDOT has rules and regulations that are different from those established for the Township under the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC) and could determine that there may be a need for a permit for any connection of a driveway that currently exists on Route 22. He noted that it is staff's recommendation that the developer investigate the issue and if required then obtain a HOP. He suggested that these are the three significant comments. Mr. Hawk noted that comments 6, 7, and 9 are similar and then there are comments 15 and 8.

Mr. David Smith, Co-chair of the Building Project and the Chairman of the Finance Committee for the Holy Name of Jesus Parish, thanked the Board members for removing comment 5 from the list of HRG's comments. He noted in reference to comments 6 and 7, he feels that they should be removed. He noted that comment seven was addressed by finding out that there was no water service on Keller Street, and the Fire Marshal's request for a fire hydrant on Keller Street is a mute point.

Mr. Smith noted that in regards to comment 9, it is not a problem to show the clear sight triangles and sight distance to where the driveways will connect to public streets. He noted that

he does not think it is necessary, but if the Township wants it on the plan, he can have it done, however, no adjustments are being made to the plan. Mr. Wolfe noted that you would be required to do this if the analysis proved that the plan had insufficient sight distance. He noted that he did not think it would show that but there is no verification of this at that point.

Mr. Smith noted that in regards to comment 8, he has applied to PENNDOT for a letter stating that the plan does not need to have an HOP. He noted that it is unknown when they will get a reply from PENNDOT.

Mr. Smith noted for comment 15, Mr. Seeds stated that there is no precedent for a fence for a three-to-one slope as it has never been asked for by the Township before. He noted that it is an \$18,000 expense that the church doesn't want to spend as it is not needed. He noted that the basin is very shallow, and it drains and has plants, and does not have standing water. Mr. Crissman questioned if the school officials are in agreement with this, he would support it, but as a former school official he would object to it because he does not want children in that area or to be in a situation if something tragic occurred, that he would regret it for the rest of his life. He noted that it is a health and safety issue for children. Mr. Smith noted that the principal and assistance principal and pastor do not feel that it is necessary since the Township does not require it for everyone else. He noted that the school is far enough away from the basin, and there are existing wetlands in the proposed area.

Mr. Smith questioned what the issue was for comment 16. Mr. Crissman noted that it was not an issue. Mr. Fleming noted that comment was addressed.

Mr. Smith noted that the remaining issues are 6, 7, and 15. Mr. Hawk noted that comment 9 will be shown on the plan. Mr. Smith noted that comment 19 was forwarded to the Township.

Mr. Wolfe noted unless a waiver is requested, the plan must be revised to show the connecting points and the sight triangles.

Mr. Crissman noted that comment 7 can be removed. Mr. Fleming noted that it is a standard comment that he adds until he sees a memo from the fire marshal. Mr. Snyder noted that Ms. Moran had Corporal Needham review the plan, and from a public safety standpoint his only comment was to provide the fire hydrant on Keller Street, however since there is no public water at that location, it is not required, and in respect to the other aspects, he is fine with the plan.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the plan will have to be revised to show how you get from the location of the plan on the property to a public street, and at that point of intersection, a sight triangle will have to be established or a waiver of those two requirements would have to be requested. Mr. Crissman noted that with regards to comment 9, Mr. Smith indicated that you are willing to provide that information. Mr. Smith noted that he would show that the church will use the same pathways and corridor of traffic that they have used for 40 years to get the traffic off the property, noting that it would be coming from the adjacent property where the new church will be built. He noted that the traffic will be coming out exactly the same way. He noted that he does not understand why it must be shown on the plan. Mr. Wolfe answered that the ordinance requires anyone with a development plan to show points of connection to a public street or request a waiver of that requirement which the church has not done. Mr. Hawk noted if the church satisfies comments 6 or 9, they go hand-in-hand. Mr. Wolfe agreed. Mr. Crissman noted that the church does not have a problem with comment 9. Mr. Smith noted that it requires doing additional work to the plan. Mr. Crissman noted that it is an ordinance therefore the Township requires that it be completed.

Mr. Smith questioned if the fence was an issue. Mr. Blain questioned how many feet of fencing would it involve. Mr. Snyder suggested that it is substantial. Mr. Smith noted that the contractor quoted a price of \$18,000. Mr. Blain questioned what the total cost of the project is. Mr. Smith answered \$8 million. Mr. Blain suggested that \$18,000 is not much in the context of an \$8 million project. Mr. Snyder noted that it all adds up. Mr. Blain responded that he understands.

Mr. Snyder showed the pond and the existing wetlands on the plan, and he explained that the area discharges under I-81. He noted that it has flatter slopes, drains dry as it is not a retention pond, and is far removed from the church and school. He noted that there is a certain amount of buffering that is required by the ordinance. He noted that he does not believe that it is necessary to install a chain link fence which ends up being a maintenance issue that collects trash and is an aesthetical concern. He requested the Township to look at those factors as it is not necessary, rather it is a discretionary item for the Board. He noted that he is not asking for a waiver, rather that the Township not require the fence. Mr. Wolfe explained that the plan did get a variance for basin landscaping. Mr. Snyder noted that was from the requirement to surround the entire basin, noting that there is much existing landscaping on one side; however he

requested a variance for the buffer since they are maintaining the existing vegetation adjacent to property, noting that the basin abuts the I-81 right-of-way.

Mr. Hornung questioned why they did not move the basin over to the west. Mr. Snyder noted that the property line is close and there is a wetland in that area. He noted in his opinion the fence is not warranted, noting that it is not a safety hazard. Mr. Blain noted that it has a three-to-one slope. Mr. Snyder noted that the bottom is planted with a lot of vegetation to serve as infiltration. He noted that he would want it to blend in with the natural landscape and look natural as opposed to something that has a chain link fence surrounding it. Mr. Crissman noted that he does not care how it looks, as long as it protects the lives of children. Mr. Blain noted that he is fine with no fence. Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. DiSanto mentioned at the previous meeting that it would have minimal water. Mr. Snyder noted that the Township ordinance requires that the basins drain dry within 48 hours, and this one is designed to drain much faster, more like 11 or 12 hours. He noted that it is not a retention pond and would not hold water. He noted that it is a detention infiltration basin. Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Crissman is fearful that it may attract smaller children and what could occur in those 11 to 12 hours. Mr. Crissman noted that it does not matter if it is school hours or not, it is a place where children go for football games, and other activities. He noted that they may leave those activities and it would be an attractive place for them to go. He noted that he has an obligation as a result of his professional background that he cannot support it. Mr. Hawk noted that he is fine with not having a fence.

Mr. Snyder noted that his intent was to get the list of comments as contained as possible before coming back to the next meeting where he will be required to accept the conditions before the Board takes action on the plan.

Mr. Hornung noted that he would like to speak more to comment 6 as he suspects that a variance would be requested for it, to revise the plan to show the sight distance triangles. He noted that it would be a waiver, so he questioned if the church would be requesting a waiver, and if that is an option, the church may want to know ahead of time if the Board would be willing to approve that waiver. He noted if the Board would not approve the waiver, then the church needs to know that. He suggested that it is not resolved. Mr. Snyder agreed that it is not resolved and a waiver would be an option. He questioned if the Board would support a waiver. He noted that the nine acre parcel has no frontage on public roads, and in order to show where the driveways exits to, which are located on other parcels, he would have to expand his mapping and do more work.

He questioned if that is really necessary. He noted that the new plan ties into existing traffic patterns on the site, and questioned why all this work needs to be done when there are no improvements. He suggested that it becomes an unnecessary exercise. He noted that is why he wanted comment six and nine stricken. He noted if he has to show it on the plan, then he has to do it, but it does not seem right to him. He stated that he could ask for a waiver. Mr. Hornung noted in his mind this issue is not resolved and he did not know if the Board would grant a waiver for this request. Mr. Snyder suggested that it is not required noting that he has an overall picture of the property and everyone is familiar with the existing driveways to Dogwood and Blue Ribbon Avenues, and also the tie into the internal parking lot. Mr. Wolfe noted the Board of Supervisors are familiar with the plan and what it connects to, however, the point of providing the information on the plan isn't for the Board's benefit, but for the future and to ensure that certain conditions exist for public health, safety, and welfare. Mr. Snyder noted that he would not ask for a waiver if the Board does not intend to grant it. Mr. Blain noted if you are looking at an \$8 million project, he did not think that you would want to take the risk of getting a nay vote for perhaps \$15,000 worth of work. Mr. Hornung questioned what the implication of some engineering drawings to delineate the exits would be. He questioned what the cost implications would be if the Board forced Mr. Snyder to show this on the plan, beside the engineering costs. Mr. Snyder answered that is basically it. He noted that you would be asking to show where the driveways connect on the plan and to show sight triangles.

Mr. Hornung questioned if they would have to widen the roads. Mr. Wolfe answered that the only issue for road widening, noting that all of this would be an off-site improvement, would be with PENNDOT and the HOP at the connection of their driveway with Route 22. He noted that it doesn't make a difference if they show it on the plan. He noted that it is only the cost of the additional engineering. Mr. Snyder noted that other than showing it on the plan, it doesn't do anything for the overall plan. He explained that he is looking to see if he can keep the costs down for the plan. Mr. Smith questioned what implication would there be if five years from now the church wants to redo the front area and they would have to go to PENNDOT to do this. He questioned having something on the recorded plan now and how it would affect future plans. Mr. Wolfe noted that future plans would succeed the existing plans. Mr. Hornung noted that he is basing his decision on what staff requires.

Mr. Hornung noted that the other issue is the fence and Mr. Crissman wants the fence. Mr. Blain stated that he does not feel that it is necessary. Mr. Hawk noted that he does not think there is a need for the fence. Mr. Crissman noted if it was any other setting, he would not care, but since there is a school there and children are there on a daily basis and in the evening he wants the fence. He noted that he wants protection for children and he will vote no. Mr. Hornung noted that he is not sure how he would vote. Mr. Hawk noted that he was fine with not installing the fence, however, now he is wavering in his decision. Mr. Blain noted that there are many instances where detention ponds are in developments with children that have a three-to-one slope that do not have fences. Mr. Crissman noted that he agrees, but they are instances where the parents have control over their children, however where there is a concentration of children during the day for school, noting that they are supervised at that time, there are instances where they children come back for evening events, and he suggested that could be an opportunity for a problem. He noted that he will not change his mind. Mr. Snyder noted that the theory is that the slopes are flat enough that someone would not fall into a basin and they would be able to walk out of the basin. Mr. Crissman noted that he publicly chastised Mr. Snyder last Tuesday night when he said that in theory, the water was required to dissipate within a certain number of hours, but in reality he knows that it is not always true.

Presentation by Rick Szeles regarding the visual effect of the solar farm proposed to be located on the closed municipal landfill on the Spring Creek Hollows development

Mr. Wolfe explained that Mr. Ron Lucas and Mr. Rick Szeles have been very attentive and attended several workshop meetings as the Board works toward the implementation or non-implementation of the solar project. He noted that they would like to address their concerns to the Board to show what effect it would have on the Spring Creek Hollows subdivision plan. He noted that Mr. Staub has prepared a Power Point presentation for the Board and Mr. Lucas agreed to postpone their presentation to this meeting due to scheduling issues.

Mr. Szeles noted that the purpose of his coming to the meeting is to discuss what he heard from the last meeting regarding the solar farm. He noted that if the alternative energy tax credits could be guaranteed for the first ten year period of the bond issue, that the Board would agree to consider the plan, especially since it would be less risky and a more viable plan. He

noted that before the Board makes any decisions, he wanted to discuss the impact of the solar farm on his development and the costs related to rectifying the impact to his development.

Mr. Lucas noted that Mr. Wolfe has been very patient with him and his client, noting that they would permit them to be part of the design process, but he wants the impact to Spring Creek Hollows to be known before making any decisions. He noted that people are living in the new development, and the developers who have approved subdivision plans have spent much money to make the necessary required improvements. He noted that he did not want to flood a meeting with the residents, but he wanted to make this presentation to the Board for them to consider what the impact is from this project and the risk requesting that the solar farm not be developed. He noted that Mr. Jeff Staub, Dauphin Engineering, has a presentation using the exhibits provided to the Township regarding the need to buffer and shield the properties from the solar farm.

Mr. Hawk noted that he attended a meeting in Cumberland County and was told that they have constructed a similar solar farm across the street from a school. He noted that it had a rather minimal visibility which surprised him. Mr. Lucas noted that the existing topography for Mr. Szeles developments and the Township landfill site is totally different than many of the other solar farm sites. He noted that Mr. Szeles visited the site in Bucks County which is comparable in size, but the topography is very different. He noted that they have installed berms around that facility, but this is different. Mr. Lucas explained that he did not want to come to the meeting when the Board was voting on the solar farm; rather he would like to provide the evidence of the impact to the neighboring developments prior to a vote. He noted that Mr. Szeles wants the Board to know what the impact is now in order to consider it when making the decision to move forward with the project. Mr. Crissman noted that it would be another piece of data to take under consideration.

Mr. Staub explained on the lower end of the solar farm, he proposed constructing a berm to block the Spring Creek Hollows Development. He noted that the berm would average a height of 30 feet, and the amount of earth work that it would take to build it would be 600,000 cubic yards of dirt at an expense of \$3 million to \$4 million. He noted that this would be needed to build the barrier to separate the Spring Creek Hollows development from the solar farm. He noted that there is also another portion of the development to the south side of the stream that will not be screened at all by the berm. He noted that that berm would have to be 65 feet high or

more as a result of the topography in that area. Mr. Lucas noted when Mr. Staub showed the berm it overlaps a good portion of the solar facility, possibly 10% of it. He noted that it is the only location to place the berm due to the stream that is located in the area. He noted that Mr. Staub created five cross sections to show how each home would need to be buffered on the north side of the stream, from the solar farm. He noted that this is not a driv-by facility; rather, the homes will constantly have a theater effect from their family rooms, kitchens and bedroom windows. He noted that Mr. Staub's estimate is to export at least half the fill to build the berm. He noted that the cross section shows a home in Spring Creek Hollow with the low point of the existing tree line, and the blue line meets the solar farm, and the dash red line is the line of sight. He noted that a berm would have to be built about the red dash line, and it would average 30 to 35 feet in height. Mr. Lucas noted on the lower end, further to the east, the berm would be even higher.

Mr. Hornung questioned if Mr. Staub showed vegetation on top of the berm. Mr. Staub answered that he was showing pine trees. Mr. Lucas noted that hardwood trees would have no leaves for five or six months of the year, and would provide no screening for the landfill. He explained that it would impact 14 lots, some of which have existing homes. He noted that this is the only way to screen the view. He explained that initially he looked to see if it could be done at the back of the lots, but there is not enough room to do that. Mr. Szeles noted that it does not only impact the 14 lots around his home, but it also impacts the lots across the ravine that are located both in Lower Paxton Township and Swatara Township. He noted that he has a contract with Charter Homes to build homes on those lots.

Mr. Szeles stated that he had a letter from Charter Homes indicating the impact to the 109 lots that they have to develop. He introduced Jamie Brubaker from Charter Homes who wished to make a statement. Mr. Brubaker noted that he has two dozen homes that he has built on the southern portion of the land across the ravine, and he has also built two of the larger homes on the north side. He noted that Mr. Staub showed an example of how a berm could be built to block the solar farm view for the lots. He noted for the 109 lots that he has under agreement; a portion of those homes would need a 60-foot tall berm in order to block the view of the proposed solar farm. He noted that his view is from the south looking up and that is the area that Mr. Staub could not design a berm for. He explained that the site that he is building homes on starts at the top of the hill, working towards the proposed facility. He noted that it was done this way as he

viewed those lots to be the larger, premium lots. He noted that there is a large open space in the back, and many people will pay a premium to live in that area. He suggested that the lots will not be sold and the solar farm will be a detriment to his development. He noted that he has expressed his concerns to Mr. Szeles with regards to the price of the lots and homes, and the pace at which he would be able to sell homes based on the effect that the proposed facility will face these homes. Mr. Brubaker noted that he wanted to share his concerns with the Board members.

Mr. Lucas noted that Mr. Staub took photographs and he would like to explain them. Mr. Staub noted that all the walks on the south side of the ravine are higher than the landfill so you actually look down into the compost facility. He noted on the left side, where Mr. Szeles has his 14 lots, it is basically level looking across. He noted that the Charter Homes properties are much higher and it is almost impossible to build a berm to screen that area. He noted that photographs do not do justice to what he is trying to show, as you can't see the detail.

Mr. Lucas noted that he would welcome the Board members to visit the site and both Mr. Szeles and Mr. Brubaker would show the Board members the lots where they could view firsthand what the impact is. He noted that the area is now a closed landfill with a Compost Facility on it that is located far away, but a solar farm would have a theater effect for viewing for the homes that have and will be built. He noted that realtors have indicated to him that the glare from the panels would not be attractive to any homeowner. He noted that it is a detriment to existing property owners, and the developers who have approved plans and have already installed improvements, and are trying to sell homes. He noted that the last two years has been very slow for real estate sales, but there are indications that business will pick up in the future. He noted that Charter Homes indicated that they will not be able to charge as much for their homes if the solar farm is installed. He noted that this would impact the price of the home as well.

Mr. Brubaker noted for the 80 homes that he has left; it would impact his price that people would be willing to pay for a lot or a home. Mr. Szeles noted that between the 14 lots, his home, and his father's home, and the 80 remaining lots, it would decrease the value by as much as 20%, and would cost him millions of dollars. He noted that it is a substantial item that he will not be in a position to walk away from. He noted that he would like the Board to consider all this when it makes its decision.

Mr. Szeles questioned, as a tax payer, if the Township could get a ten year commitment for energy credit. He questioned if the greater risk would be down the road as there could be only one small piece of technology to make the entire investment obsolete. He noted if the utilities are no longer required to purchase the solar power as it has alternative energy sources it could be a big problem, and he suggested that there would be more risk in subsequent years.

Mr. Szeles thanked the Board for their time. Mr. Lucas noted that Mr. Wolfe has been keeping him informed of the Board's progress on this project. Mr. Hornung noted that the Board in the past has considered using that area for recreational purposes, such as a dog park and things like that and the Board received hostility from the neighborhood. He noted that the Board is looking to do something with that site, noting that there is a fair amount of land sitting there that the Board would like to put to some good use. He suggested, in the future, the Board will be looking at something to do with that land that is good for all. Mr. Szeles noted that he would appreciate that and he would ask the same consideration that the people from Kendale Oaks received with the screening that was provided for their development. He noted that there is a right place to locate a solar farm, but he does not feel this is the place. He noted that he would not object to a dog park.

Continued discussion regarding proposed sanitary sewer improvements between  
Fox and Catherine Streets in the PC-2C mini-basin

Mr. Weaver explained that CET and staff prepared a brief Power Point presentation concerning the PC-2C mini-basin options. He noted that during the previous workshop meeting, he presented a design that traverses the existing neighborhoods between Fox and Catherine Streets. He noted that there is an established tree growth in the easement, and he has received phone calls from some neighbors requesting him to come up with different options. He thanked CET for getting the four options ready in a two-week time period. He noted that he has seven or eight slides to show for the various options for this mini-basin.

Mr. Weaver noted that Option 1 is CET's original design, and Option 2 and 3 would reroute the sewers down Fox Street or Mountain View Road. He noted that Option 3a would include rerouting the sewers in Mountain View Road and abandoning the existing sewers in the right-of-way north of Fox Street. He noted that Option 4 would be to line the existing sewers. He noted that a schematic design was made for each option.

Mr. Weaver noted that Option 1 calls to line one property since there were existing sheds, a garage, and a fence over the easement. He noted Option 2 runs the sewers down Fox street to James Drive and it would eliminate the right-of-way that has been in existence for 35 to 40 years. Mr. Shannon noted that two homes would require grinder pumps for this option.

Mr. Weaver noted that Option 3 would reroute the sewers down Mountainview Road and eliminating the right-of-way that is currently there. He noted that Option 4 would include lining the sanitary sewers.

Mr. Weaver explained that the estimated costs for Option 1 would be \$214,000; Option 2, \$294,600; Option 3, \$281,100; Option 3a, \$251,400; and Option 4, \$190,200. He noted that this is an engineer's estimate prepared by CET that is normally within 5% to 10% of construction costs. He noted in many instances, there are complications that engineers cannot foresee that will raise the price.

Mr. Blain noted that the lining option is the cheapest; however, lining only lasts for ten years. Mr. Weaver noted that the Township does not have any history for this option.

Mr. Weaver noted that Option 1 has the most pros as it is consistent with the Authority's design policy for the 2007 Consent Decree Decision to implement the 20 year replacement program. He noted that it is the easiest construction, with the lowest replacement cost option. He noted that the lining costs are slightly lower. Mr. Shannon explained that Option 1 is the lowest cost option involving replacing sewers. He noted that lining is cheaper but it does not replace sewers, it only lines them. Mr. Weaver noted that the pro for Option 1 is that new pipes would be installed, and it would eliminate most of the I/I and has the longest life span, normally 50 years. He noted that it clears the right-of-way and provides for future access and maintenance. He noted that is the reason why most of the neighbors are in attendance as they do not want the Township to clear the right-of-way as they want the trees to remain. He noted from an Authority standpoint, there are no cons, but there is much public opposition to the plan.

Mr. Weaver noted that the Authority has no cons for Option 2 noting that it was a higher cost, and would require a legal opinion for grinder pumps as two homeowners would need to have them installed. He noted that it requires replacement of the PVC pipe that would otherwise not need to be replaced on Fox Street, and cause major traffic disruption on Fox Street.

Mr. Weaver noted that the Authority has no pros for Option 3, noting that it will also require a legal opinion on grinder pumps, and the sewer trenches could be as much as 21 feet

deep, that could cause a trench collapse, and it would be more disruption to traffic on Mountain Road. He noted that additional test pits may be need to be dug to determine if there is rock, noting that it is difficult to maintain slopes at deep depths. He noted that there are steep laterals at weak points for infiltration into the system, the cost is more expensive, and future repairs for deeper laterals will require significant additional expenses to the property owner. He noted that there may be possible legal challenges from the homeowners since their laterals are only seven or eight feet deep now, but if the sewer is installed at a 22 foot depth, their laterals would have to be dug down to that level.

Mr. Weaver noted that the pros and cons are very similar for Option 3a.

Mr. Blain noted if there were no pros for those options, why were they listed. Mr. Weaver answered that he was asked to look at any option possible to appease the public in attendance of not clearing the trees in the right-of-ways and replacing the sewers.

Mr. Weaver noted that Option 4, which lines the sewers, maintains the gravity service for all homes and is the lowest construction cost. He noted that sewers normally are designed to last 50 years; however, the present worth costs for lining is not available as there is not enough data on lining. He noted that the cons are that the lining is not equivalent to new sewer in the removal of I/I. He noted that the liner can fail as there is a small space between the host pipe and the liner. He noted that it is not consistent with the current design policy to replace all CP/VCP pipe where feasible and cost effective, he would need additional temporary easements for access to manholes, and will require multiple access points through properties. He noted that the sewer mains, laterals, and manholes are only lined, so there is potential for weak points for infiltration into the system. He noted if there is a problem with the liner installation, the sewer will need to be excavated for replacement or relocated where there are permanent structures. He noted that there are also potential difficulties with lateral liners and T-liner installations.

A question was asked why the pipe under Catherine Street was being lined. Mr. Shannon noted that the policy is to replace the ACP pipe and asbestos pipes that have been in for 40 years, except where there are extreme conditions that make it cost prohibitive. He noted that Catherine Street was built after the original sewer was installed, and there are many feet of fill in the area, as well as a large culvert that would have to be dug up. He noted that the cost to dig under Catherine Street is significantly more. A person noted that there are many cons but he would still go ahead and do the lining option, noting that he wants to see the film on how to do a liner. Mr.

Wampler noted that there are two spots that would need a liner on the preferred option. Mr. Weaver noted that the standard policy is replacement over lining and the only time he uses lining is where it is almost impossible to replace the pipe or it is cost prohibitive.

A gentleman noted that he appreciates Mr. Weaver's fiscal responsibility to the Township, but he would ask Mr. Weaver to put himself in the neighbors' shoes when considering what will occur, now and in the future. He noted if Mr. Weaver is negative to lining, which is unproven, you would certainly want to go with the proven technology, but there are still two weak links that he is willing to line because of dollars. Mr. Weaver questioned if it made sense to the gentleman and he explained that it is not a negative in that case since the Township would save a lot of money. He explained that the Authority is doing lining on another project in front of Arooga's on Colonial Road where the disruption to traffic and utilities relocations made it necessary. A person noted that the total difference in costs was only \$80,000. Mr. Weaver noted that the costs for digging up Catherine Street would be much greater than lining, due to the fill that was placed in the area. He noted that there would be a great deal of disruption to the community as well. A person asked how much more it would be since the entire option is only \$80,000 more. Mr. Weaver noted that he could get those numbers for the person. Mr. Shannon noted that he did not design the option to replace the sewer under Catherine Street and had no cost estimate for that design.

Mr. Blain questioned if the Authority would have to replace that sewer under Catherine Street sooner or later if it was lined. He noted if lining lasts 20 years, then it would have to be relined again. He questioned if lining decreases the diameter of the pipe over time. Mr. Weaver answered no; explaining that the liner is only .6 millimeters and a PVC pipe is ¼ inch thick. He noted that you are only installing .6 millimeters of material inside the pipe, and the resin would provide the strength. Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Weaver is proposing that the sewer lines in Catherine Street would stay there in perpetuity. Mr. Weaver answered that it would only be for that one line. He noted that he has no data to state how long that lining will last, he noted it could last 50 years, but he does not know. A person noted that there is lining proposed for Mountain View Road also.

Mr. Weaver noted that there would be difficult ties-ins with the lateral liner and T-liner installation. He noted that he wanted to explain all the cons except for the original design, and he explained that he has difficulty with placing the disruption and hardship on other persons. He

noted that it is a Board decision to make and he can only prepare the options. He noted that the lining option was never considered in the first place since he thought he would have to clear the trees anyway. He noted under the old technology you would have to get to all the manholes to insert the liner material and to cure it with steam. He noted that he met with Jim Clark from Mr. Rehab on Monday and he was told that they have equipment that can access the lines from Fox Street that shoots the material into the liner. He noted that there will be a need for temporary easements, noting that it would transfer the easements to other people.

A gentleman noted that he appreciates what the Supervisors do and that he would not want to do the job. Mr. Weaver noted that everything in yellow would have to be lined and explained that there is an existing easement that was recorded before all the homes were built. He noted that it is older than 40 years and after the work was done, all the trees grew up in the area.

Mr. Weaver explained that Mr. Rehab would shoot the resin into one manhole. He noted that you need water to push the liner, and then you steam it to cure it. He noted that Mr. Rehab could reach two runs at one time from one manhole. He noted that he could not use the existing easement due to the trees, so he would have get easements to the manholes.

A question was asked if there was a need to remove any trees to access the manholes. It was noted that trees and people's property values are all affected by this. He noted if a new development was built today, they would never be allowed to run an easement through a swale in the back yard area where there are trees. He noted that there would be safety concerns, noting that it would be installed in the road where it should be installed. He noted for less than \$100,000, an amount that the Township was promised by a developer earlier in the meeting, he noted that it could save this whole issue and put it where it belongs and avoid all these issues. The gentleman explained that he has a power point that he would like to show to the Board members to show who they are as a community. He noted everything that has been shown to this point has been a two-dimensional, black and white, pros and cons approach, looking at it from an aerial view as if it is a farmer's field that is being developed. He noted that they have a very special and unique area, places where we play together and in fact Frank and Nicki were even married in that area. He noted that it is a very unique place, and before the Board makes a decision to take all those trees, and his property, and other people's property, he would like the Board to look at his presentation.

A woman noted that they are here as a community to support each other and not to fight with each other, unlike an earlier group that attended the meeting. She noted that we are here as united neighbors trying to do the right thing for the community. Mr. Crissman noted that the Board always tries to do the right thing also.

A gentleman explained that he would like the Board to listen to those in attendance and to look at the pictures. He noted that he purchased his property three years ago, and the trees that were behind his house were the reason for his attraction to the house, however, for his wife, it was the house. He explained that he added a porch to enjoy the backyard and the wildlife as well. He noted that the easements would remove all the trees from behind his home. He noted if it was a viable option, where you could pump sewage from Mountain View Road into Fox Street, you would eliminate this problem today and tomorrow for people for the next 40 years. He noted that it would be putting the sewer into the streets where it normally is located. He noted that he is curious, as to how all his neighbors are on the new system from the front. He noted if he puts a bathroom in his basement which he plans on doing.... Mr. Weaver noted that it was cheaper to run the sewer in the back due of the elevations. The gentleman questioned how this was allowed 12 years ago. Mr. Weaver noted when a developer builds a home, he is allowed to tie into the public sewer wherever he wants as long as he follows the Authority's specifications. Mr. Weaver noted that they could have tied into the front but chose to tie in from the back. The man noted that the fifteen homes all chose to tie in from the front except one chose to tie into from the back and he did not understand that. Mr. Weaver noted that it was cheaper for them to tie in from the back as it would have cost them a lot of money to pump the sewage. He noted that that person wanted a gravity service and they did not want to have to pump up their sewage. He noted that that house sat down from where the street was and in order to get basement service and have a bathroom, they could not do it without pumping to so they ran it out the back. The gentleman noted that the neighbor only has a bathroom and not a shower. A man questioned why two people on two different streets are the only ones that were allowed to use that method if it was cheaper as most contractors go the cheapest route. He noted that the contractor that built his home could have done the same thing and saved money. Mr. Weaver noted that he did not think this is relevant to the discussion. A gentleman stated what is relevant is whether that person will be willing to install a grinder pump to go into a new system if the sewer line is moved to Fox Street or Mountain View Road.

Mr. Weaver noted that staff would never support Options 2 or 3 as the list is so long, he would never be able to get to a resolution. He noted that he would not want to debate those two options as there are so many reasons not to do it. He noted that throughout the United States and in the Township, you have a collection system in the neighborhood, and then a trunk sewer, and every sewer system has a trunk sewer. He noted that it does not go into the streets, but in the back yards, and then the trunk sewer goes to the interceptor sewer, and it goes along the streams and to the sewer plant where the sewage is treated. He noted that the people are proposing that he reroute all the trunk sewers and that does not make sense from an engineering standpoint. He noted that it would set a precedent, for every Authority project that he must schedule for the next 40 years, since the Authority is responsible for replacing 60% of the system. He noted that he provided an option that would satisfy the people, and that is lining and that is the decision the Board will have to deal with. He noted that the Board will have to decide if they are comfortable with lining and take a chance that it will be a cost effective choice. He noted that he did not know if the Board can make that decision tonight. Mr. Hornung noted that he can't and it seems that a lot of this discussion is mute, because if it comes back that lining is an excellent way to maintain the life of a sewer and the cost is cheaper, that is an option the Board would go with. He noted that without knowing that information he did not see that any decision could be made, not that the Board could make a decision during the workshop session. He noted that he needs more information to make a decision. Mr. Weaver noted that he is trying to get that information as fast as possible.

Mr. Blain questioned how old the lining is. Mr. Weaver noted that the sewers were installed in 1971. Mr. Blain noted that the pipe is 40 years. A question was asked if the Authority knows if the sewers are leaking. Mr. Weaver answered that every sewer that was built in 1971 is leaking. He explained if it is not leaking, once you replace sewers in one place without replacing them in another location, the ground water rises and hydraulic pressure from the ground water table which is greater now, causes the pipes to crack and they get bigger and more water goes into the sewer because the ground water table is elevated since it is not going into the sewer anymore.

A gentleman noted that the pipe behind his house is now at the lowest spot, so the ground water can't get any higher. He noted that it is already at its highest level as it follows the creek. Mr. Weaver noted that the amount of ground water that will be traveling down there will be

much greater. A question was asked when the pipe was inspected. Mr. Weaver noted that it was installed 40 years ago. The gentleman questioned when was it inspected. Mr. Weaver noted that he inspects all sewers as some point in time. The person wanted to know when it was inspected. Mr. Weaver explained the history on what the Authority has done. He noted that CET presented to the Authority a plan to eliminate the hydraulic overload. He noted that according to DEP, the Township is responsible to eliminate the hydraulic overload, and CET presented a repair program based upon the idea that you could do the repairs two or three times, and it would be cheaper than replacing the entire system. He noted that program did not work because when you repair one area, the other areas started to leak and the repairs did not last long. He noted that he was convinced, if you do the worst areas, and replace the entire system, you get all the Infiltration and Inflow (I/I) out, and although it is more expensive, it provides for a better overall job. He explained that Mr. Norm Hoffer, a former Authority member, pointed out that \$200 million looks like a huge amount of money, however, when you look at it over 30 or 40 years, with inflation it only comes out to 5% per year. He noted that replacement in the long run is much better than doing a repair. He noted that a roof may only last for so many years, and you can patch it, but the next option is to replace it. He noted that the inspections are no longer needed as the Authority is replacing the pipe as they are 40 years old. He noted that it was costing the Authority a lot of money to inspect sewers. Mr. Shannon noted that the mini-basins were prioritized as a result of a metering program that was based upon peak flow per equal dwelling unit. He noted that rather than inspecting every sewer to say there was a crack here or there, the replacement work is being done on mini-basin basis. He noted that this mini-basin ranked number one in the second five-year plan, so if the question is did he take a look at the sewer in the people's backyard, the answer is no. He noted that it is part of the overall plan. Mr. Weaver noted that staff is fearful that the lines are full of tree roots. The gentleman noted that there is no way staff could have gotten down to the tree line to test the pipes. Mr. Hornung explained that they go with the lowest hanging fruit, and so they metered everything and looked at the flows coming out of that development and keep going to the next one that has the highest flow and replace them because the Authority is required by law to eliminate so much I/I every year. He noted that they start with the worst and fix it. He noted that the Authority has been doing this for 15 years and many costly mistakes were made in the beginning but this is the most efficient process yet. He noted that the Authority has been looked at from all over the United

States as the way to fix the problem. He noted that a lot of engineering has gone into the process to look at what is the “dollars per gallon” cost of I/I, trying to keep it around \$2. He noted that the Board has also look at other solutions, such as building storage tanks, and other things but the Authority must reach a certain level before it could look at that options or the tanks would be multi-million gallon tanks. He noted that once the Authority reaches a certain level it may look to build storage tanks.

A question was asked of the estimated cost of the entire sewer project. Mr. Weaver answered that Paxton Creek alone is \$100 million. A person noted that this cost is only \$80,000 as compared to \$100 million. Mr. Hornung noted that the Authority must look at each basin. The person noted that the Board considered money when it discussed the Holy Name plan. Mr. Weaver noted that trunk sewers are throughout the entire Township, and if you use that argument, the costs keep rising. A person noted that they were not advocating that the Board make a unilateral decision, rather make an intelligent choice based on what you have in front of you, to look at the smaller and larger communities and the impact. He questioned if the impact to the greater community is so great that you have to devastate everyone’s property. He did not think so, not when doing this project hinges on whether you take an easement from my property and destroy my property in the process. He noted that the chart that shown conveniently showed the pipe being replaced in the easement, but that is not the plan. He noted that the plan is to build out of the current easement at three properties. He requested the Board to look at each fact and circumstance. He noted that he had a Power Point to show the Board and if the Authority was going to provide more information on the lining process, and not vote on it before that, he would be happy to table his presentation until a later time.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Board went on a Road Tour and looked at the site... A person noted that there are lots of people who do road tours and you don’t know what the area is until you get out of your car and walk through. Mr. Hornung noted that he understands, and he did not know if it was worth watching the Power Point as he and all the Board members hear what the people are saying, and the Authority will do what it can to not take down the trees. He noted that the Board cannot make that decision tonight and when the Board takes up the discussion again, all the neighbors will be invited back. A woman noted that it would take less than five minutes to show the pictures. Mr. Hornung noted that he is getting the feeling from the people’s passion. A woman noted that you cannot see or tell what we are talking about until you see the pictures.

She noted that we sat here for three hours and listened to everyone else. A person noted that there were many projects talk about tonight that discussed aesthetics and property values and the people are not alone in their concern. He requested the same consideration from the Board for their plan. Mr. Hornung noted that the Board does understand, and he did not know what would make them think that they don't.

Mr. Blain suggested that we should just let them show the Power Point.

A gentleman questioned for Options 1, 2, and 3, when it was discussed to reroute the sewer, if it is being rerouted into a more main line, then you would end up eliminating a whole section over time, and initially it may cost more, but then you would not have to deal with this one section since it has been directed to the main line. He suggested that over time it would reduce the costs and he suggested that the Board should look into this. Mr. Weaver noted that when you take a line that is a certain depth and change it to make it deeper; you open up other problems. He noted that it may make sense to you... A person noted that it is not that much deeper. Another person noted that the Board would look at the options and challenge that question. He noted that staff is bringing this information to the Board, but the staff is the staff to the Board members who need to challenge it to its fullest. Mr. Hornung noted that he does not need to be told how to do his job. The person stated that he understood that and that was not what he meant, but the Board ends up managing the process from a different view. A woman noted in 40 years, the Authority would be digging up the yards again and ruining everything again. Mr. Hornung noted that the new technology lasts longer than that.

Mr. Weaver noted that he always has public meeting prior to the start of a min-basin project and he has never been in this situation before, so he admitted that it is a little different as most people want him to remove the trees. He noted when he does work on private property to replace a private sewer, nine times out of ten the owners are glad to have the trees removed. He noted that he had Dr. Lacasse, a tree expert from the Shade Tree Commission review the plan. He noted that they have looked at the area and they have a landscape plan that he thinks would end up being a better end result. He noted that it is hard to get this point across to the public since there is such opposition. A person questioned what kind of plan would get him a 40 foot tree before his five year old turns 15. He noted if Option 1 was chosen, there is a way that a contractor can mark trees that must be saved. A gentleman noted that he marked the line, placing a string that goes between two manholes that covers over a 30 foot path that would require the

removal of 90% of the trees. He noted that the contractor can work in a very small area. A question was asked how wide the swath would be for the project. Mr. Weaver noted that typically it is 30 feet, but for this plan the Board could chose to make an exception to that.

Mr. Blain requested that the Power Point presentation be shown.

From the Power Point presentation, it was noted that the people in the neighborhood have named the tree lined area Shady Grove. He noted that it is an area where people gather and celebrate activities, noting an annual camp out. He noted that the new easement would eliminate the entire row of trees, and he proceeded to show all the areas that the trees would have to be removed. The slides proceeded to show the many areas where the trees would be removed. He noted that they have created and maintained walking trails in the Shady Grove area. He noted that it is a very safe place for the 17 children to play in, of which 14 are nine years or younger, and it is very secluded from the street. He noted that many trees would have to be removed with the new easement. He explained that the neighbors really enjoy this area in the fall as well. A person noted that these people would lose their property values if the trees are removed. He noted if the trees are cut down, the people will lose their natural screening, and if 90% of the trees are cut down, the natural habitat for wildlife will be diminished.

A question was asked, what would be done to protect the children during the construction process. He noted since there are children in the area, it is a concern for the parents, and fencing should be installed.

Mr. Hawk asked to break the discussion at this point. He noted that the Board members have gotten the message. Mr. Weaver suggested that there may be a need to have a meeting with the public depending on what option the Board chooses. Mr. Hawk noted that we need to look at some options, and then invite the neighbors back for a meeting. He noted that there is a need for middle ground to find a solution and he suggested that more work needs to be done on the project. He explained that the Board needs to meet with two more groups this evening. He noted that Mr. Weaver and CET will do more studying and evaluations to look at other options. Mr. Hawk noted that no decision will be made at this time without the neighbors being called in for a meeting.

Discussion with the Chiefs of the Township's fire companies  
Regarding 2011 fiscal year funding needs

Chief Tom Swank explained that Mr. Crum mentioned during the Open Forum part of the last Public Safety Committee meeting that he wanted to meet with the Board of Supervisors to discuss an increase in the fire tax millage rate for real estate taxes. He noted that it has not been increase in 20 plus years and the fire companies cannot continue to maintain the current level of services with the funds that it is receiving. He noted that the three chiefs are appreciative of everything the Board has provided; however, he noted that it would cost \$7.5 million to implement a career Fire Department. He noted that the economy has made times very difficult, and he suggested that the Board needs to consider increasing the fire tax. He noted that they can't understand why the tax rate is higher for library tax than it is for fire protection.

Mr. Hawk noted that it is tough times for all of us because the Board is facing a serious shortfall in the budget this year. Chief Swank noted that the fire companies are doing more with less. Mr. Hawk noted that the Township is in the same position. Mr. Crissman noted that it is also true individually as well as collectively. Chief Swank explained that the three budgets are as low as they can get. He noted if it would not be for the Firemen's Relief, they would have serious budget problems. He noted that there is no reason that the Township should not be providing the best service for our citizens. He noted that the fire companies have quality apparatus, but the three fire companies cannot continue to keep pace with the current funding levels.

Mr. Hawk noted that he is not sure how to respond. Mr. Crum noted that the fire personnel are not necessarily expecting a response, rather he wants to make the Board aware of the current fiscal situation, especially since the Board is working to develop the 2011 budget. He questioned if an increase could be made or if the Board could find extra funds to supply to the fire companies, it would be greatly appreciated. He noted as of yesterday, Linglestown Fire Company's apparatus repair budget is over \$50,000 and he is only getting \$127,000 from the Township. He suggested that it was thought a few years ago that the apparatus would last 15 to 17 years, and suggested that a more realistic number would be ten years for the engines.

Mr. Hawk explained, in two weeks, the Board will have a budget session, and one of the things the Board has tried to do is to develop a strategic plan for future planning for the next six to seven years. He noted that they also tried to parallel that with projections for monetary income. He noted that the Board will take this request into consideration as part of this process.

He suggested that it could not be done overnight, but perhaps it could be done over a series of years. Mr. Crum noted that a little extra money would be very helpful.

Chief Fife noted that it is getting more expensive to replace fire trucks. He noted that the pumper that they purchased this year cost \$468,000 through the State Costars Program. Chief Payne suggested that he was running about 175 calls a year when the purchasing plan was developed. Chief Swank noted that his call volume is 700 per year. Chief Payne noted that all the fire companies have taken care of the maintenance for the apparatus in the past. He noted that they may not be required to spend \$50,000 a year for maintenance but they must budget for preventive maintenance. Chief Fife noted that he recently spent \$18,000 to replace a radiator in his 1998 Seagrave. He noted that is half the money they took in for fundraising for the year. He added that it is only one repair bill. He noted that everything on Paxtonia's fire apparatus now functions. He noted that he does not want to pull up to a house and explain to the homeowner that something on his truck does not work. He noted that Mr. Rowel, the President is very supportive of this. He explained that the Paxtonia Fire Company has some funds in its savings account, however, he is looking where the money will come five years down the road for the fire trucks. He noted that his third fire truck is no longer covered by the warranty, and this is a problem, noting that last year he budgeted \$1,500 for repairs and this year he is budgeting \$12,000 for the same truck. He suggested that he can stretch the fire trucks' usage a little more to maybe 12 years.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Board supports the reduction in the number of hours the volunteers need to put in, however, he remembered some time ago, a consultant was hired and he informed the Board that they should not throw a lot of money at the fire companies. He noted that they were told that doesn't work. He noted that he they were told to be very smart in how the Township provides funds for the volunteers since it is important that they create the comradely and teamwork between the volunteers. He stated that he is compelled that the Board fund the fire companies in a smart manner. He suggested that it would be good for the fire chiefs to figure out what they need as he wants to spend the Township's money wisely.

Mr. Byerly noted that one of the highest expenses to fund is maintenance of the equipment. He noted that it costs a lot of money to keep the apparatus on the road. Chief Fife noted that he and Chief Swank both signed three-year contracts with IM Apparatus to handle all their vehicle maintenance as it locked in the shop rate. He noted that they do all they can to try to

cut costs. Mr. Hornung noted that he would imagine that to be true as you would not want to do any additional fundraising. Chief Fife noted that you can't cut costs when it comes to saving lives, and that is what the fire volunteers do. He noted that when someone's home is on fire, they do not want to hear that the fire company did not have the funds to fix something on their truck or that it is not working. He noted that he would be more than willing, as a homeowner, to pay more for fire trucks than library books, and he thinks that any reasonable person in the Township would feel the same way. He noted that it is all in the presentation. He agreed that money does not get memberships. He explained that the Paxtonia Fire Company made the same amount this year as it did the previous year. He noted that he had 16 sets of turn-out gear when he was sworn in last January, and now there are 40 sets of turn-out gear, and at the next meeting he must ask to spend more money for equipment. He noted that he has increased the number of volunteers for the fire company and he understands that money does not produce memberships.

Mr. Hornung noted that he has a hard time asking the volunteers to go out and raise funds. Chief Fife noted if he could have his wish book answered, it would be that they would have enough money that he could tell his volunteers that they do not have to do any more chicken barbeques unless they wanted to do it for the community. Mr. Crissman noted that it is a teambuilding event as well. Chief Fife noted that Paxtonia sponsored fireworks in George Park and he hopes to do it every year whether they get financial assistance from the Township or not, because he was told that Paxtonia's public image was not that great. He noted that many people did not know the Fire Company existed, and now, as a result of the fireworks some people may write a check for \$50. He noted that hopefully the funds will double next year because the fire company did something tangible that the public could see and enjoy. He noted that they got a lot of positive feedback on that and positive things produce positive things.

PSD Johnson suggested that this discussion should be continued during the Public Safety Committee meeting to be held on Thursday night, and as he works with staff through the budget process he can relay this information to the Board members and Mr. Wolfe.

Mr. Crissman thanked the Fire personnel for coming to the meeting and for waiting so long to make their presentation. Mr. Hawk agreed with Mr. Crissman's comments.

"Otta Know" Presentation: Nothing

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Mr. Blain made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 10:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle  
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman  
Township Secretary