

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop Meeting held December 11, 2012

A workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6:05 p.m. by Chairman William B. Hawk, on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

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

Also in attendance was George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steven Stine, Township Solicitor; PSD David Johnson; Jason Campbell, SCEMS; Dave Ionni, Deaven Woods; Jeff Staub, Dauphin Engineering, Richard Yingst, Paul Hepler, and John Zervanos, Cider Press Associates; Mark DiSanto, Triple Crown Corporation; Mike Smith and Priscilla St. Jacques Glusko, Greenway Committee; Bruce Senft and Sandra Prah, Friendship Center Operation Board, Stan Smith, Parks and Recreation Board and Arts Council; and Bob McIntyre, Parks and Recreation Board; Brian Luetchford, Parks and Recreation Director; Christine Hunter, H. E. Black and Heroes Grove Committee; Sam Robbins; Public Works Director; Matt Miller, Field Engineer, Public Works Department; Tom Swank, Colonial Park Fire Company; and Watson Fisher and Ted Robertson, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Peyton Blain led in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Continued discussions regarding the selection of an emergency medical services provider

Mr. Hawk explained that he would move this item forward in the agenda since PSD Johnson is present to discuss this item.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board conducted interviews with both SCEMS and Life Team from Pinnacle Health representatives a week ago based upon responses from a Request for Proposals (RFP) that was provided by both organizations. He noted that there was not enough time after the interviews for further discussions and it was requested that this be placed on the agenda for this meeting. He noted that the Board must determine what its next step will be.

Mr. Hawk questioned if PSD Johnson had anything to add to the discussion. PSD Johnson noted that he was present to answer any questions the Board members may have.

Mr. Hawk explained that the Board has not made a decision and the purpose of the interviews was to gather information from both organizations to help the Board in considering its options. He noted that any decision the Board makes will be in the best interest of the citizens of the Township.

Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Wolfe if the Board must vote on this decision. Mr. Wolfe answered if the Board does not do anything then the current agreement for services would continue. He noted to take advantage of either proposal that was provided to the Board from SCEMS or Life Team the Board would have to act affirmately on one of the agreements. He noted that there are financial considerations above everything else, with all things being equal; the proposals provided by both organizations are lower than what is currently paid for services. Mr. Crissman noted that the RFP's are for five years and that is something else that should be considered. Mr. Wolfe noted by looking at both proposals, it provides for a more detailed picture of coverage than the Board had at any time in the past. He noted that it includes the number of stations, where there would be stations, and the response time frames for responses have been addressed by both providers. He noted that the Board is in a position to make a decision as it would like to do this as soon as possible as both organizations need to make preparations for the next fiscal year.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the Board could make amendments to the current plan as opposed... Mr. Wolfe explained that the Board could negotiate this agreement with either provider as it is not a competitive bid environment and it is for professional services and the Board can negotiate as it sees fit.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the Township had a contract with SCEMS in the past. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mr. Hornung noted that the Board could initiate another agreement.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the Board should make the decision at a public meeting and would it have to be made at the December 18th meeting since it is the last meeting of the year. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. He noted that no additional advertisement would be required for that meeting. He noted that the Board could wait for the first meeting in January but he would not recommend doing that.

Mr. Seeds noted that he and Mr. Hornung were part of the Board of SCEMS in the past and he has seen a drastic improvement in that organization in the last year or so, particularly as it appears to be financially well run. He noted that both organizations would serve the Township well; and he would use the adage, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it." He noted that he is leaning towards staying with SCEMS for the future as he has confidence that they will continue to provide the service that they have provided to us for the past 55 years or so. He noted that is where he is headed at this point. Mr. Blain noted that looking at the financial stability of the organization, and ability to turn their balance sheet around, their strong cash flow position, their collection of their receivables, a completed audit with an unqualified opinion; for him the projections going forward are that they are pretty well positioned to be successful and profitable in the future. He noted that he would be more inclined to move towards SCEMS; however he would not be inclined to a five-year contract. He suggested that it is too long of a contract and it should be a shorter term contract, allowing the Board some options in the future in the event there would be some financial issues. He suggested that the Board would not have any issues from a service perspective. He noted that the quality of care is there but his only concern is from the financial side and he would be concerned with a five-year deal; needing it to be shorter.

Mr. Hawk noted that there is some leaning in one direction; however, the devil is in the details. Mr. Blain agreed.

Mr. Hornung questioned how Mr. Wolfe would sit down with SCEMS to hammer out the details. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would do that with PSD David Johnson. He noted that he would need to know the parameters the Board wishes to consider. Mr. Hornung noted that he needs a contract to be less than five years subject to negotiations. He noted, due to the newness of the turnaround, he wanted to make sure it continues in that direction. He explained that he agrees with Mr. Blain as that price is up for negotiation; noting that we talked about it before and will let Mr. Wolfe negotiate it. Mr. Wolfe noted that he saw the financials for both organizations and from his readings; he is not sure a contribution from Lower Paxton Township for either entity is required to provide service. He noted that he could proceed from that position if you would allow staff to do that. Mr. Hawk requested Mr. Wolfe to explain that. Mr. Wolfe explained if you want staff to negotiate a less than five-year agreement and to do so from a cost factor for what it costs Lower Paxton Township, SCEMS indicated to the Township that they

were financially sound and could provide service for no contribution. Mr. Hawk noted that would be part of the negotiation with SCEMS.

Mr. Crissman noted there are a couple of issues to deal with; the length of the contract, and if we go with SCEMS, what if any, contribution would be made to them. He noted that he agreed, that the service has been good and he would think that it would continue. He noted that he would like board representation, which is extremely important, to have a voice at the table but his biggest issue is not with current financials but the history that has come to the Township. He noted that there is a turnaround and they deserve an opportunity to try to put that in place. He noted that he would like a limited contract to monitor it very closely; however, he would not want them to be in a financially unstable situation so they would be unable to provide services to the community without having a backup plan.

Mr. Hawk noted that the audience probably has a sense of where the Board is going with the decision and what needs to be worked out are the details for the contract. He noted for the benefit of the Township and SCEMS, we need to have our figures in place as it would affect the budget for both entities. He noted that we don't take a vote at a workshop session as it is open for public conversation and would be ratified at the next business meeting, December 18, 2012.

Mr. Hornung noted that he would like Mr. Wolfe to consider, as part of the negotiation, response times, and if the times are too long that we would negotiate the agreement again. He noted that the number of people on board is another item as well as how many ambulances would be dedicated. He noted that SCEMS has the new location by the Paxtonia Fire Company and it is nice to have it in the Township and a distinct advantage at this point. He questioned if there is anything else we should try to stipulate, and if we do provide a contribution, that we should require an audit of where the money goes because of things that have happened in the City of Harrisburg. He noted that these are the things that should be discussed as part of the negotiations.

Mr. Seeds noted that we should direct Mr. Wolfe to immediately start negotiations in order to act on it next Tuesday.

Mr. Hawk noted if we come to a meaningful understanding or agreement we could put off the formal decision until January as long as we know parameters. Mr. Wolfe explained that he would meet with Mr. Campbell and if we can put a document together that is agreeable to

both parties between now and next Tuesday night, we will put it on the agenda. He noted that either way he will have a report for the Board. Mr. Hawk suggested that Mr. Campbell and his financial person, Geoff Bingaman, be part of the negotiations.

Mr. Crissman noted that he had an issue with the age of the vehicles and the long-term replacement program. He noted that he had a concern if the equipment would break down and be unable to provide the services that the citizens need as that is his greatest concern and the reason for not going for more than a one or two year contract maximum. Mr. Hawk noted from his memory of last week's interview it was part of the plan that SCEMS would be replacing vehicles on a yearly basis. Mr. Campbell noted that he would replace two vehicles every year until they are all replaced and then it would be one vehicle on an annual basis after that. Mr. Hawk noted, in sitting down with Mr. Wolfe and PSD Johnson, Mr. Campbell needs to tighten that knot a little tighter. Mr. Crissman noted that he would like to see it reduced to writing.

Mr. Blain noted that as the Board negotiates the contribution, his personal piece is that the \$100,000 needs to be significantly reduced but he does not know what that number needs to be. He noted when he looks at the financial statements he sees an organization that is flush with cash, that has \$463,000 in cash with a current payable for payroll at \$176,000. He explained that there are not many businesses with a three to one current asset current liability ratio that does not include the AR collections as well. He noted that he does not know of any non-profit organizations that the Board supports that is actually in a strong financial position. He noted that this needs to be taken into consideration in the negotiation process. He noted that the 12/31/11 numbers for the Audit shows current assets of \$1.5 million and the current liability is \$135,000. He noted that it is a financial organization that is very strong at this time. He noted that the Board does not fund other non-profit organizations that are doing financially well and this needs to be part of the negotiations.

Mr. Wolfe noted that part of the reason for beginning the process in the first place was the fact that the annual contributions, to include this year were \$224,000. Mr. Crissman noted that it was a shock when Mr. Campbell came in with his number, noting that the past fiscal history does not match with what is currently ongoing. He noted that he wants to make sure SCEMS is on the right track. He noted that Mr. Campbell stated, at the last meeting, a zero contribution, and he questioned him if it still stands. Mr. Campbell noted that he did not recall

saying that. Mr. Crissman noted that we all heard it. Mr. Campbell noted that he did not recall hearing that, rather Jeff and he had talked about, at the minimum paying for the fuel costs, noting that the audit will cost typically \$10,000 a year; however, that is something SCEMS should have been doing anyway. He noted that he would be open for negotiations.

Mr. Hawk told Mr. Campbell to bring his pencil sharpener with him. He noted that you have all heard the direction that the Board is heading.

Mr. Seeds noted that a Board member asked Mr. Campbell what would happen if the contribution was zero and he stated that he would continue to supply the service. Mr. Campbell noted that he remembered that. Mr. Crissman noted that the Board translated that as zero and he questioned if it would have any impact on SCEMS' ability to get grants or federal funds if the Township did not make a contribution. He noted if the Board made a token contribution; would it be enough for your files in order to file for other grant money to show that there is support from the municipality. Mr. Campbell stated that is correct. He noted that each municipality has to contribute in some way, shape, or form for SCEMS to apply for funding.

Mr. Hornung noted that we must be penny wise and dollar short towards the corporation to have some reasonable contribution, having it to be as low as possible but not jeopardizing the company, but it must be substantiated. Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Hornung's point is valid and it seems that most agreements are amendable so if it becomes a problem we could amend the agreement.

Mr. Crissman stated to Mr. Campbell that he wants a short term contract in order to prove himself, noting that he is on the right track. He noted if he was to make the decision on fiscal accountability of where you were, he would not be supporting him as he would need bucks to do what he did. He noted that SCEMS appears to have turned itself around and to that he extends his kudos and he would hope that it would continue, but he has to protect the citizens. Mr. Blain noted that he would echo Mr. Crissman's comments for the turnaround to produce an organization with a strong track record that is financially secure in the future.

Public Comment

Mr. Gerald Hopple, 1009 Top View Drive, noted that he has attended numerous meetings regarding the stormwater situation in his backyard. He questioned if there are any plans to do

anything to rectify the situation, noting that the Board intends to review and prioritize the 2013 stormwater projects later in the agenda.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Hopple is invited to wait until that agenda item is discussed as there will be a complete discussion for what the Board plans to do, including for Mr. Hopple's area. Mr. Hopple questioned if there is money allocated for his area in the 2013 budget. Mr. Hawk answered that it would be discussed later in the agenda.

Mr. Hopple noted that he called a few weeks ago and left a message with the Supervisors about someone cutting down trees and throwing them in the creek bed. He noted on the night of the heavy rain that occurred, on Veteran's Day, someone put a big evergreen tree that was recently cut down in the creek bed behind the house. He noted that he left a message on the BOS voicemail and with Mr. Wolfe. He questioned why employees who enforce the Township Ordinances don't do anything until they get a phone call. He noted that it is against the law to cut down a tree and dump it in a creek bed. He noted when he reported it he wanted to know why someone did not check it out. Mr. Wolfe explained that the ability of the Township to prove that there has been a code violation and where it came from is limited unless we have a witness. He noted that the Township can not prove that the tree came from any specific location other than the property that it is on, and it is the property owner where the tree is found who is responsible party. He noted if we would have had an eyewitness account, then we could have filed charges under the property maintenance code. He noted that we must be able to prove who did it.

Mr. Hopple noted if you walk along the creek bed, the fellow who has his backyard along the bank, along the edge, has all his leaves piled up against the creek bed, but he surmised that the Township cannot do anything about that as no one saw him rake his leaves even though it is in his yard. Mr. Wolfe noted that we can site the property owner that has the violation.

Mr. Hopple noted if you drive along Earl Drive, there is a person has two vehicles sitting down by his shed and a bunch of wood sitting by the shed. He noted that someone should be able to see that. Mr. Wolfe noted if no one has reported it to the Township, noting that he drives Earl Drive all the time, he has never seen it. He noted that he is not looking for it, but if Mr. Hopple would supply the Township with the address, then the proper enforcement would be taken. Mr. Hopple noted that he does not have the exact address with him as the mailbox number and house number on the front door is missing. He noted if you are on Curvin Drive going west on Earl

Drive, it is on the left side before you go down the dip and come up the hill by Mrs. Antoun's home.

Mr. Hopple noted that there is an ordinance for how far from a creek bed you can put items. He questioned if a person can rake leaves up to the edge, or must it be 20 yards or more from the creek bed. He noted that some people have wood piled up along the creek bed and wanted to know how far that should be from the creek bed. Mr. Wolfe answered that he did not know.

Mr. Hopple noted that he has a fear of flood waters and that is why he will hang around for the other items on the agenda. He noted that he did not want to be a pest but he is concerned with what he lost in 2011, noting that Mr. Seeds came around to see his place. He noted that we need to get that water issue fixed. He noted that Middletown realized that noting that with all the building up they did, no one was looking out for future water drainage issues. He noted that something has to happen in his area.

Request to amend the preliminary/final subdivision plan for Deaven Woods

Mr. Wolfe noted that Dave Ionni is present to represent the Deaven Woods plan.

Mr. Ionni explained that he is a home builder in the Township and would like to discuss the Deaven Woods Development. He noted that it has a cul-de-sac, much bigger than a typical cul-de-sac, as it has a true circle at the end. He noted that there is one road in and one road out with sidewalks proposed for both sides of the street. He explained that he is a proponent of sidewalks and lives in this neighborhood. He noted that the three family residential lots located in the interior circle of Plowman Ridge require a lot of sidewalk. He noted that there is redundancy in that portion of the cul-de-sac. He stated that there is sidewalk on the outer loop as well as the smaller section for the inner loop.

Mr. Ionni noted that he has interested parties who would like to build with him on the inner loop and one deterrent is the redundancy of sidewalks, and the quantity of sidewalk. He explained that no one wants to shovel that much sidewalk and as there is much sidewalk on the outer loop, it would be logical to assume that we do not need the sidewalk for the inner loops as well. He noted that he spoke with most of the residents in the neighborhood and they see his point.

Mr. Seeds noted that he drove over to view the area and he can see Mr. Ionni's point. He noted that you will need to put a lot of fill in for those outside lots. He questioned if the lots were sold. Mr. Ionni answered that some are sold and that is the reason he is at the meeting as the person who wants to contract with him is older and does not want to shovel that much snow. Mr. Seeds questioned if the outer circle lots are under contract. Mr. Ionni answered that he has two lots under contract. Mr. Seeds noted that it could be a long time until the sidewalks on the outer loop are constructed if those lots aren't sold. Mr. Ionni noted that is true as he does not know when they will be sold. He noted that he has the fill for those lots and that is not an issue for selling the lots, he noted that more people would be interested in those lots once he starts moving the fill in that location.

Mr. Hornung questioned, for the Board to agree to this change, do the other property owners... Mr. Stine answered yes, that they must give their approval. Mr. Ionni noted that he was not aware of that. Mr. Stine noted that Mr. Ionni is a lot owner, and since other people have bought property that are not part of the plan that has changed from what it was when they bought it, they would have to sign off on it. Mr. Ionni suggested that it would not be much of an issue as he has talked to everyone. Mr. Hawk noted that he looked at the site and he agrees with Mr. Seeds.

Mr. Wolfe explained that the Township Engineer had a comment noting if the Board would waive the sidewalk requirement on the inside of the cul-de-sac, the curb depressions would have to be restored to regular curbs. Mr. Ionni answered that he would do that. Mr. Wolfe noted if it was not done now, it would have to be bonded as part of the Improvement Guarantee. Mr. Ionni noted that he would do that when the homes are constructed.

Mr. Crissman noted when you submitted the plan for approval; you knew you would have to put the sidewalk in. Mr. Ionni answered that he was not the original developer for this plan. Mr. Crissman noted that the original developer knew that it was a requirement of the plan. Mr. Ionni explained that he spoke with the original developer and he never noticed that it was on both sides of the circle. Mr. Crissman noted that the original developer agreed to that part of the development. He noted that it was agreed to at the time the plan was submitted and Mr. Ionni inherited it when he made the purchased.

Mr. Hornung noted that he is okay with removing the sidewalk in the inner circle. Mr. Blain answered the he is also. Mr. Seeds noted that he has a concern that it will be a long time as he will be filling the lots in he questioned if there is enough soil to fill in the two outer edges where the drop off is. Mr. Ionni answered that not every townhome will sit above curb level. He noted that sometimes they sit below the curb line and that is what he would like to see happen with those lots. He noted that there is more than enough fill to be supportive of those lots. He suggested that it would not affect the implementation of the sidewalks, as they will be put in as the land is filled. He noted if he doesn't get the waiver, he will still have to put the sidewalks in. Mr. Seeds noted that there are many developments where the sidewalk is not complete since the lots have not been sold. He noted that we get complaints from the people about the lack of sidewalks.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the sidewalks could be completed on the outer edge. Mr. Hornung noted that they would be destroyed by the construction vehicles.

Mr. Wolfe noted that once he receives the requisite signoffs and the proper dollar amount for the bond, then he would schedule it for a Board meeting. Mr. Wolfe questioned if the Township has used a form in the past, for sign-off's. Mr. Stine answered that the people have to sign the revised plan sheet. Mr. Wolfe questioned how many property owners are there. Mr. Ionni answered about ten. Mr. Stine suggested that you could fit those signatures on a plan sheet. Mr. Wolfe suggested that Mr. Ionni should do that.

Mr. Crissman noted that he would not support the waiver, even though Mr. Ionni should have enough votes to approve the waiver. He noted that it should be as originally approved and the developer assumed that responsibility and that integrity should be met. Mr. Ionni noted that he won't argue the point, but he thinks that they made a mistake and he is trying to correct the mistake.

Request from Cider Press Associates, LLC, to discuss the Concept
Master Plan for the TND at Fairmont and Cider Press Roads

Mr. Hawk noted that Richard Yingst, Paul Hepler, Jeff Staub and John Zervanos are present to discuss this item. He noted that he and Fred Lightly met Mr. Yingst in his office and were privileged to see the concept plan providing for a reduction in density from what it was originally planned and a modification in the plan as well.

Mr. Staub thanked the Board for the opportunity to discuss the revised concept master plan for the Shadebrook Development. He noted that the concept keeps the central commons area and commercial zone in the center of the site. He noted that the higher density is located near the commercial area with the lower density lots located around the perimeter. He explained that he has had difficulty with Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in obtaining the permit for wetlands associated with the former Shadebrook Plan. He noted that DEP has stated that they will not issue a permit to build the originally approved plan; therefore he had to revise the plan.

Mr. Staub explained that there is less density as the original plan had 318 units and the new plan has 259 units. He noted that the prior plan backed into wetlands whereas this new plan will not affect any wetlands, and the third change is that Mr. Yingst would like to preserve the existing streets of Fairmont Drive and Cider Press Road. He noted that the prior plan reconstructed those two streets and in some instances relocated them. He noted that the only major reconstruction will be to moderate the curve for Fairmont Drive where the old farm house and pond were located, making it a more drivable curve. Mr. Hornung questioned if it would help to slow the traffic speed. Mr. Staub answered that the curve will be somewhat milder than it is now, noting that he plans to split the street at that location to provide for islands, to enhance the common area and focal point above the pond.

Mr. Hawk noted that the curve is rather sharp at this time; however it will be moderated. Mr. Staub noted that the plan calls to increase the radius to 200 feet from 80 feet. Mr. Crissman questioned if that is the only change in the configuration. Mr. Staub noted that the last major change is that the grading and infrastructure costs are significantly less than the original plan as it will be a doable project. He noted with fewer units there are less infrastructure costs.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he is displaying the plan facing north.

Mr. Seeds questioned if he has met with DEP to show them the new plan. Mr. Staub answered no, as the final decision is dependant on the outcome of this meeting tonight. Mr. Seeds questioned what the difference is for the commercial use. He explained that he would have liked to be able to view the prior plan alongside the proposed plan. Mr. Yingst answered that it is the same, requiring five acres of area that is remaining. He Staub noted that the Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) ordinance requires that 5% of the lot area be

designated for commercial development and in this instance it is 4.3 acres; however, the old plan was a little larger with the same acreage. He noted that the square footage for commercial is a little less than the old plan as the old plan was about 145,000 square feet that included retail, restaurants, and commercial space for offices. He noted that he is now at 70,000 square feet, a little less than half. Mr. Seeds questioned what you envision for the commercial space. Mr. Yingst answered that he would be looking for an Arooga-style restaurant, and coffee shops, as he needs one good size user to get it kicked off and then have smaller uses migrating in. Mr. Seeds noted that there must be a limit on the square footage. Mr. Yingst noted that parking is the biggest limit.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the reduction in commercial space includes the parking area. Mr. Staub answered that the plan provides more off-street parking that will support the commercial development as the older plan had parallel parking spaces some distance away from the central commercial area. He noted that almost all the parking is in a parking lot behind the businesses with a little angle parking on Fairmont Drive.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the price range is reasonable. Mr. Yingst answered that it would be in the range of \$225,000 to \$450,000 with different size lot for single-family homes as well as duplex housing. Mr. Hawk noted that the configuration is different than originally submitted. Mr. Wolfe displayed some of the concept homes by way of Power Point. Mr. Seeds suggested that they are attractive homes. Mr. Yingst noted that the entire concept is to get the garages back from the front of the homes, 20 feet back from the face of the property. Mr. Seeds questioned if this plan will have alleys. Mr. Yingst answered that it will have some garages on the alleys. He noted when he had the alleys it required more of a flat surface to get the alley in versus the street which would have resulted in a tremendous amount of earth moving.

Mr. Seeds questioned if this plan was presented to the Planning Commission. Mr. Yingst answered no. Mr. Seeds noted that there is no need to change any ordinances. Mr. Hawk noted that he and Mr. Lightly liked the concept plan.

Mr. Crissman questioned if anyone would have an objection with the new plan over the older plan, what it would be. Mr. Yingst answered that he did not find any positives to the other plan as compared to this one. He noted that he likes getting away from the townhomes as there are enough in that area of the Township. He noted that this plan has more single-family homes.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Staub if he foresees any conflicts with DEP. Mr. Staub answered that he is not asking for a density bonus and the TND ordinance provides the option if the plan sets aside a certain amount of open space and goes above and beyond the architectural requirements, designate it as a age-restricted development or goes above the requirement for active recreation facilities. He explained that he is not doing any of that and staying with the four units per acre. He noted that the only area in question regarding DEP is Fairmont Drive as he will be widening it and adding curb and sidewalks, and also Cider Press Road, as he is asking for a waiver for sidewalks along the north side of Fairmont Drive next to the wetland areas and there is also an area along the stream where he needs a stream buffer. He noted that he has to widen Fairmont Drive and in order to do so, he will have to place fill within that stream buffer. He suggested DEP would require a permit to do that although it may be a general permit. He noted that is the only impact to the environmentally sensitive areas on the site.

Mr. Crissman questioned if there will be other waivers that Mr. Staub is aware of at this point. Mr. Staub answered that he may be asking for a limited number of waivers for the stormwater plan although it has not been developed yet and he is not sure where he will be with infiltration. He noted that the biggest concern is if the Board does not grant a waiver for sidewalks. Mr. Wolfe suggested, for the previous plan, the Board granted a waiver for sidewalks along that area. Mr. Yingst noted that he would be installing five foot wide sidewalks for the added space to allow more room to walk by someone as there will be more pedestrian traffic in this area. Mr. Seeds noted that would be to get to the shopping area. Mr. Staub noted that the commercial district has ten foot wide sidewalks.

Mr. Seeds questioned if this was a fee-in-lieu approved project. He questioned if there would be clubhouse or would the plan provide its own recreation. Mr. Yingst answered not at this point. Mr. Hawk noted that the developer would be doing something around the pond. Mr. Yingst noted that he would be installing walking paths. Mr. Seeds questioned if the rest would be fee-in-lieu money. Mr. Yingst answered yes staying with the same concept.

Mr. Blain noted when he met with Mr. Yingst in March along with Mr. Hawk and Mr. Lighty, it was thought that the plan was dead and that he was looking to do a R-1 housing plan. He questioned what changed his mind in the past months. Mr. Yingst answered that he spoke with each Board member and Mr. Wolfe and all he heard was to think outside the box. **He noted**

when he was on vacation he decided to keep it pretty much the same. He explained that he was provided a few concept plans, and he made some changes to those to get the density down and still be able to afford to do it. Mr. Blain noted that it is a big plus to decrease the density. Mr. Hawk noted that you are still keeping the walking paths, and a sufficient commercial district which would help to keep people in the TND. He questioned if Mr. Yingst was committed to doing the improvement at Locust Lane. Mr. Yingst answered yes.

Mr. Staub noted that this plan does not have townhomes, as the old plan did. He noted that this plan has 64 duplex units or 32 buildings and 195 single-family homes. Mr. Crissman questioned if they are clustered separately. Mr. Staub answered that they are mixed. Mr. Hornung noted that he likes the plan but as you increase the amount of people who have bought homes, Cider Press Road and Fairmont Drive will have traffic issues. He noted that he would like a traffic review to determine if there would be a major issue, upon build out of the development, especially when it brings in outside people to the commercial area. Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Hornung was mainly discussing the area near the pond, the T intersection. Mr. Staub noted that the idea behind the TND is to slow traffic which is why you have the cart way filtering into a 20 foot space. He explained that the area will have angle back in parking. Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Staub if there would be a stop sign at Cider Press Road to stop the traffic entering Fairmont Drive. Mr. Hornung noted that you have to watch that people don't use other streets in the development to avoid that stop sign. He noted that you don't want to send more traffic to the area where you don't want it. He noted that you might want to consider a turning lane or something like that. He noted when you have a 15 mph speed limit zone, and everyone slows down, the people don't seem to adjust to it, and drivers who need to pull out from side roads don't realize the slower speed as it doesn't register with them. He noted that they tend to wait for a large open space as if the traffic was traveling 60 mph. He noted that slower speeds don't always provide the proper reaction that you would expect. He noted that it might be a good opportunity for a three-way stop sign. Mr. Seeds noted that you could install a right-turn lane from Cider Press Road as well. Mr. Hornung noted that he did not know what the major traffic pattern would be for that location. Mr. Yingst answered that he would look at the traffic study to determine responses to those suggestions.

Mr. Wolfe noted that would be for the next level of design. Mr. Seeds questioned what the darker blue area indicates. Mr. Staub answered that it is a center isle with plantings and curb. Mr. Seeds asked if that parking would be for the stores. Mr. Staub answered yes.

Mr. Seeds questioned if each unit would have its own parking and would there be additional parking areas. Mr. Staub noted that he had a few areas where we have overflow parking areas. He noted that 40 homes front on open space.

Mr. Blain noted that it looks like a good plan.

Request from Triple Crown, Inc. to discuss the yield plan as it is applied to the Residential Cluster zoning district

Mr. Wolfe explained that Mr. DiSanto's issue is his ability to get a zoning designation match with the development plan that has been approved for Stray Winds Farm (SWF). He noted that Mr. DiSanto would like to discuss a specific text amendment to the Residential Cluster (RC) zoning district.

Mr. Mark DiSanto explained that he sent Mr. Wolfe an email that was forwarded to the Board members. He noted that the process for this plan started six years ago since he acquired the Stray Winds Farm land. He explained that he designed one of the original RC developments at Blue Meadow Farms, and back then, Mr. Robbins was the zoning officer at that time. He noted for the original cluster ordinance, the density for 100 acres could allow that you build two units per acre, allowing 200 units. He noted that the cluster ordinance changed where it allowed the use of the underlying density but you had to deduct wetlands and 15% of the steep slopes. He noted that it further reduced the allowable density for this property. He noted prior to his acquisition of the Stray Winds Farm land, there was another change in the density calculation, the Yield Plan; if you had 100 acres you could do 200 units, but the Yield Plan required you to lay out a road system, all the lots, avoiding steep slopes and wetlands and stormwater basins. He noted that a Yield Plan really impinges on the density, so in his case, for the SWF land that he has on the Lower Paxton Township side, made up of 248 acres, taking the R-1 zoning with a density of two units per acre he would be able to build 496 units. He noted when he designed the SWF he had a Yield Plan done and it was approved by Dianne Moran, the current Zoning Officer. He noted that the Yield Plan permitted 374 units, over a 100 unit reduction from what

you would typically think it would be for the underlying zoning. He noted that he received a density variance from the Zoning Hearing Board and ended up with an approved plan of 449 units about halfway between the highest and lowest number permitted. He noted that the plan was involved in lengthy litigation, even though Phase I of the plan was recorded. He noted that he does not want to build it while there is pending litigation.

Mr. DiSanto noted if the Board would consider dropping the Yield Plan calculation from the RC, it would allow him to get back to the underlying density of 496, although he is committed to building this plan with 449 units. He suggested that it would eliminate the litigation, as it would be totally compliant with the zoning, as there are only a very few pieces of property zoned RC, an overlay zone, that only the Board can put into place when it is properly applied for. He noted that the SWF Plan is zoned RC but he had not kept up with all the modifications of the ordinance, before it was re-codified in 2006. He noted that he thought he was entitled to two units per acre, which was his mistake, but this would be a very simple and typical action by the Board to do an adjustment to an existing ordinance that would move it back to where it was before. He noted that he sent an email to Mr. Eric Epstein, from Stray Wind Area Neighbors (SWAN) and had some dialogue. He explained that he is meeting with the Board tonight to have further dialogue to determine if they would consider this change to move the plan forward. He noted that the Board members liked the plan and the community and SWAN and residents liked it as well.

Mr. DiSanto noted while listening to the conversation on the TND with Mr. Yingst, he noted, when you get into a cluster concept with a TND, and look at all the open space and active recreation, noting that he has a significant investment in walking paths and park area, you typically get a density bonus, not a decrease as in the Yield Plan. He noted that he could work SWF as a TND but he does not think there would be a viable commercial unit and it would work. He noted when you do those things you get a density bonus as opposed to a reduced density.

Mr. Hawk questioned what was SWAN's reaction. Mr. Hawk noted if we remove the Yield Plan, you could go to 496, although you stated that you would leave it at 449 units. He noted that it would require a leap of faith. Mr. DiSanto noted that he would put it in writing to Mr. Epstein, however he did not know if this was presented to SWAN yet.

Mr. Wolfe noted if you are interested in doing this, make the math work. He noted instead of making it two per acre, you could make it 1.7 units per acre. He noted if you would do it that way, the plan would meet the zoning, yet it could not be expanded to what currently exists. Mr. DiSanto noted that is the only issue because if he doesn't do this he could go for 496 units and he has put so much effort and time and design and costs into this plan. He noted to redesign the plan with the way the ordinances have changed, and County Conservation, there would be a significant cost to it, but if that is a solution, he would be happy to do it. He noted that he would put it in writing as for what he wants to do. He noted that he wants to move this plan that was supported by the Township, community and SWAN forward.

Mr. Seeds noted that it would ruin the entire concept of the Yield Plan. Mr. Wolfe noted that it only would concern the RC district and it is one that is specifically called out in the ordinance as a carryover from the old ordinance and the reason it was maintained was because there were parcels of ground that were approved and developed and could not do something else. He noted that the intent is not to make a new RC, just to accommodate the existing plans. He noted that there is some undeveloped land that is RC, such as Montrail and a portion of Mr. McNaughton's tract up on the mountain and Mr. Yingst's property. He noted that most are built out or the improvements have been installed.

Mr. Hornung noted that people would buy mountain land and they would have all these houses on it, even though they should not build that many houses on it. He noted that the Township could have written this a little differently for making a Yield Plan allowing for a little higher density but not to exceed two per acre for the original land. He suggested that we could revise it to accommodate flexibility. He noted that it would take into account mountain land or wetlands that you can't build on. He noted that maybe as Mr. Wolfe has pointed out we may not have to go to that extent. Mr. Wolfe noted that there are very few places where this is an issue in the Township. He noted that the Yield Plan would be applicable to the low and medium density, TND zoning districts in the future for undeveloped land. He noted that you don't have RC land existing in the Township to any great extent that is undeveloped.

Mr. Crissman noted that SWAN only received the letter yesterday and they have not had an opportunity to respond yet. Mr. DiSanto noted that he would like to know if the Board would consider this and if so, he would meet with the solicitor and staff and quantify what parcel this

would affect. He noted that he could have more dialogue with SWAN to see if it would be acceptable. He noted that it would take a little time to present something formally. Mr. Crissman suggested that Mr. DiSanto should continue his conversations with staff as Mr. Wolfe may have a possible solution. Mr. Stine noted that the one concern is that you have to mix and match ordinances as Mr. DiSanto had an approved plan to the SALDO, but he wants to make adjustments to the Zoning Ordinance providing a SALDO for one vintage and a Zoning Ordinance for another vintage and he did not think you can mix and match the ordinances. He noted that you have to apply the ones that are in effect now or not. He suggested that it may not make a difference. Mr. Wolfe noted that the SALDO has been redone since the plan was approved. Mr. Crissman suggested that they continue their discussions on this. Mr. Hawk noted that he would like to see everyone agree to the buy in. Mr. Crissman noted that SWAN needs to respond to this as they only received the letter yesterday. Mr. DiSanto noted that is all he was asking for and he would work with staff and SWAN.

Discussion with the Community Engagement Committee
regarding proposed goals and objectives

Mr. Luetchford noted that the Community Engagement Committee (CEC) has not been accepted in a formal manner by the Board, however the various groups that he is a liaison to: Arts Advisory Council, Parks and Recreation Board, Greenway Committee and Friendship Operating Board, all recognize a potential need for fundraising. He noted that they have been struggling with budgetary issues for years now and they have come up with ideas for ways to raise funds. He noted that the CEC wanted to discuss, with the Board, the potential for reviewing their purpose and goals and their potential future of those goals.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the following members of the CEC are in attendance: Mike Smith, Greenway Committee; Bruce Senft, Friendship Center Operating Board; Sandra Prah, Friendship Center Operation Board; Priscilla St. Jacques Glusko, Greenway Committee; Stan Smith, Parks and Recreation Board and Arts Council; and Bob McIntyre, Parks and Recreation Board.

Mr. Smith noted that the Township has many amenities that make it a great place to live in; however the challenges come down to a lack of capital resources both in the human and financial forms. He noted that the purpose of the CEC is to engage the community as he thinks

that members of the community will be willing to step up to support the amenities and a long term goal of fundraising to provide the financial resources to sustain the long term work.

Mr. Crissman requested Mr. Smith to share with the Board what you have done thus far to provide guidance and direction. He questioned, once the funds are raised how they will be dispersed. Mr. Smith answered that it is a work in progress, noting that they have realized the role of the Supervisors and the Parks and Recreation Department. He noted that the CEC will want to work under the guidance of the Board of Supervisors. He noted that the CEC has reached the point where it is starting to fill the structure for the organization that will carry it forward. He noted that the CEC has met on several occasions and formed sub-committees that will have various responsibilities within the organization, such as fundraising, public relations for events and marketing. He noted that the CEC is made up of members from the different boards and committees that work under the Parks and Recreation Department.

Mr. Blain questioned how do you foresee this mechanically working, working with the Board of Supervisors. He questioned if the CEC would prioritize certain community projects that are important in regards to raise the capital to make them happen. Mr. Smith answered, if the CEC was to make a blind request, the response would be minimal, so it has to establish priorities and something that it can show to the public as a motivator and progress as well for additional support for all efforts. He noted that it will be treading new water for the process as it would come down to a sustained message delivery to the systems of the Township and the entities that operate within the Township to reinforce the message that these are valuable amenities, times are tough and we need public support.

Mr. Hawk questioned if there is anything specific that the Board should be thinking about at this time. Mr. Blain noted that there is plenty for the Board to think about in regards to having four committees within the CEC, would the focus be more of recreational activities and how to fund those knowing that municipal funding through the General Fund is limited. Mr. Hawk noted that he was thinking in regards to specific projects that the Board would like to move forward with, he questioned if the CEC is at that point yet. Mr. Luetchford answered no.

Mr. Smith noted that we have internally identified priorities and are ready to move forward once we have been appointed by the Board to do so.

Mr. Crissman questioned if you have separated the wants versus the needs of each group. He noted the Arts Council may want something but everyone else may not agree with its urgency. Mr. Smith noted that we have talked about this a little and it is the reason for having the representation from the various communities. He noted that the CEC will bring everyone under one umbrella. He noted that part of the question is we are looking for a holistic approach to this, recognizing that the Friendship Center or a particular park ties into the Greenway Committee's work or a venue for the Arts Council to use. Mr. Crissman noted that he is concerned with the unity of one group and moving forward in that area.

Mr. Blain noted that we have an issue with the unity of one group in the Township trying to work together. Mr. Crissman noted that the CEC can work together as a team.

Mr. Seeds questioned if you have a mission statement completed. Mr. Smith noted that we have set up a purpose statement, goals and structure for the CEC. Mr. Seeds questioned how you would go about raising funds. Mr. Smith answered that it could be a matter of social media, direct mail, email marketing, but for the short term, soliciting that would require a data base of employers in the community. He noted that he has a list of 32,000 addresses from the Township's Newsletter, and 2,000 emails on which to build. He noted that the CEC needs to contact those folks through some type of communication. Mr. Seeds noted that there is a lot of competition out there for funds. Mr. Smith noted that the CEC is at a disadvantage and we need to make a concerted effort.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the CEC is willing to get commercial advertisers for the park areas. Mr. Smith answered that we have discussed that and recognize that we would not go down that path without the approval of the Board. Mr. Hornung noted that it is controversial but a lost opportunity for raising funds. Mr. Smith noted that it can be done with a great benefit but it can be a headache as a couple of years ago, the City had issues when Capital Blue Cross sponsored a health walk along the riverfront.

Mr. Crissman noted that the CEC is looking for a approbation of its existence and approval of its goals and purpose statement. Mr. Crissman noted that you have my support. Mr. Hawk noted that you have the Board's support and he is looking forward to when you will come back with recommendations and explain how you plan to get the funding.

Mr. McIntyre noted that there was some discussion with some of the Committees and Boards about starting their own individual foundations and they would end up competing against each other and going after the same corporate and individuals for funding. He explained that there is a cost involved in setting up a foundation therefore he met with Mr. Stine and Mr. Houck to talk about how the CEC could do this, offering the same benefits at less cost. He explained that he has a number of simple and major concerns. He noted that the Greenway Committee would like to make more brochures and get trails marked and it costs money. He noted that there needs to be a major capital drive for the Friendship Center as it is getting older and there are major issues with capital needs. He noted that a concern was what if someone does not designate how the funds should be used, noting that ideally we would have a separate account for each board or committee so if a committee was raising money the CEC would funnel it into their account. He noted if someone wants to make a donation or have a general drive, we would put the money in a general fund then we could make a decision as to how it should be spent. He noted that the CEC is cognizant of the current financial needs, and future needs for the Township and what we can and can't do. He noted that having representation from all the boards provides a clear understanding of the overall needs.

Mr. Hawk noted that was a clear explanation of what the intent was for the CEC fundraising purposes. Ms. Prah noted that HESAC was able to raise \$700,000 to start the Friendship Center, and it took a lot of work and effort.

Mr. Stan Smith noted that the purpose is that the Board feels good about the CEC's goals knowing that the details are not worked out but what direction it is going in. He noted it is a huge win for the Township that we have four major boards and committees that have a lot of connections in the community that have agreed to do it together. Mr. Hawk agreed. Mr. Crissman noted that it is a great team effort. Mr. Smith noted that the next charge is to come back with a plan of action. He noted we hope to make a significant difference in the quality of life for the community.

Request to submit an application for Military Innovative Readiness Training (IRT) support on behalf of Heroes Grove Memorial

Mr. Wolfe explained that the Heroes Grove Project is submitting, to the U.S. Army Reserves, an application for construction services in the development of the Heroes Grove facility.

Ms. Christine Hunter, explained that she was present a few months ago to provide an update on the project to the Board. She noted that the big push for this year is to move forward with fundraising. She noted that \$12,000 has been raised from several events, and the project has received a grant from the Dauphin County Gaming Commission in the amount of \$45,000, noting that they have matching funds in the account for that grant. She noted that the project has applied to the Military Innovative Readiness Training (IRT) program to use the Reservist who train as construction crews to work on real projects to benefit communities. She noted that the application has been made for these services and the Foundation for Enhancing Communities, the 501c3 overseer for the project, was the applicant, however, the application contains a question as to who owns the land and that is the Township. She noted that the Township must be a co-applicant for the project to be assured that the Township is in agreement with this project. She requested that the Board of Supervisors will approve listing the Township as the co-applicant for this request. Ms. Hunter distributed a new application with the Township information included in it. She noted that the IRT Program asked the Township to be a co-applicant and for some environmental information. She noted that she has added the name of the co-applicant to the application. Mr. Hawk questioned if the Committee is listed on the application. Ms. Hunter noted that the Committee is not a 501c3 entity; however the Heroes Grove Foundation functions under the Foundation for Enhancing Communities who was the original applicant. She noted that they also asked for environmental information and she added a check list and an opinion showing that there are no environmental impacts for development of this project.

Mr. Crissman noted that the co-applicant is signed by Janice Black. Ms. Hunter explained that she was the signatory for the Foundation for Enhancing Communities. She noted that the Heroes Grove Committee uses the Foundation as their 501c3, therefore they are the applicant. She noted that the Foundation understood that it was part of their responsibility to do this and that it would fall under their umbrella.

Ms. Hunter noted that the Township has not approved the plan yet; what we are trying to do is to raise funds to create a project and then come to the Township with plans that are tailored to the funds that have been raised. She noted that it does not commit the Township to approve the plan. Mr. Crissman noted that he does not want it to result in the Township and the Foundation having to resolve issues since we are the co-applicants. Ms. Hunter questioned Mr. Crissman if he would be more agreeable with the Township being the sole applicant. Mr. Crissman noted that the Township would have to receive all the funds and do the distribution. Mr. Wolfe noted that there are no funds to be received; this is the authorization of the US Army to do work. Ms. Hunter noted that the Army would provide the labor. Mr. Stine noted only labor and no materials.

Ms. Hunter noted that the military will make its decision in February for the work to be done in 2014. Mr. Seeds noted that the Township will provide the fill to construct the plan. Mr. Wolfe noted that staff has no issue with this request and it would be approved by a resolution approved by the Board. Mr. Seeds noted if we do not do this, then the U.S. Army National Guard can not do the work for free. Ms. Hunter noted that she is trying to leverage the funds that the project receives and it would be a great help. She noted that she has a meeting scheduled with Department of Conservation and Natural Resources next week. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would prepare a resolution authorizing the submission of the grant for the December 18th meeting and Mr. Hawk would be signing the documents.

Ms. Hunter noted that page five of the application shows that she advertised in The Paxton Herald a statement that would allow contractors to state that they wanted to be a part of this project. She questioned if she should provide an advertisement for the Township's website. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would be willing to do this. Ms. Hunter thanked the Board for its help with this project.

Final Recommendation of the Village of Linglestown Committee

Mr. Hawk noted that the Village of Linglestown Committee has provided a final recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to close out the project, and they have identified nine items that the Board needs to act on. He explained that the Committee has completed its mission and it no longer needs to exist. He noted that they would like the Board to continue off-street parking in the southwest and northeast quadrants in the Village, work to protect historic

resources within the Village, continue to enhance alleys, and correct some minor landscaping deficiencies for park benches and trashcans. He noted that the Committee would like the Township to continue the request to reduce the speed limit within the Village, although it is a PENNDOT road and the Township has no say in this matter. He noted that some further work would be the identification of bus stops within the Village, and to work with the Linglestown Area Civic Association, and the Merchants Association to support the 250th anniversary of the Village that will take place in 2015. He noted that this would best be done through a formal resolution. Mr. Crissman questioned if the date of 2013 is correct on the recommendation. Mr. Wolfe noted that it should be 2012. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would put this item on the agenda for the December 18, 2012 meeting as well.

Review of 2013 priorities for Storm Water Projects

Mr. Wolfe distributed two items, a list of storm water projects and a prioritized list. He noted that it is a running list that has been maintained by the Public Works Department detailing the storm water problems and deficiencies that it has encountered over the past several years or most recently, 18 months. He noted that the stormwater infrastructure check list that is included in the Board's packet containing Part A and B activities, noting that the Part A activities have been completed amounting to over \$1,101,728.00 in storm water projects. He noted that the Board borrowed \$750,000 in Pennsylvania Infrastructure Bank (PIB) loans in 2011 and this year the Board borrowed \$2 million of which \$1.5 million was designated for storm water activity to be undertaken in 2012 and 2013.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board wanted Mr. Robbins to prepare a prioritized list of projects and estimated costs of those projects for consideration into the future. He noted that these are projects and issues that we are aware of. He noted that there are other areas of the Township with old storm sewers but we are not experiencing significant problems in those locations at this time so they are not on the list. He explained, as we move into sanitary sewer mini basins and make the replacements, staff encounters old storm sewers as well and it becomes a ridiculous scenario to replace a sanitary sewer and repave the road and leave the old storm sewer in the ground that may not have failed but will do so in the near future. He noted with the

roadway paving program, the storm water program in the future will, in part, be dictated by sanitary sewer improvements and consent order.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board asked Mr. Robbins to list the Earl Drive project for survey and base map study in 2013 and he expects these projects to be completed up to number 14. He noted after the bills are paid for the 2012 projects, he believes there will be sufficient money to fund project number 14 on the list; however the list has 33 projects with a total cost of \$3,960,919.70. He noted that it is a prioritized list of projects to be started in 2013 up to number 14 with projects that could be funded in years after, depending upon the availability of finances. He noted if you go to projects 30 and 32, those are mini-basin projects scheduled to take place in 2015 where staff knows that the storm sewers are old and the ball park estimates for these two projects total over \$ 2 million. He noted that the sanitary sewer projects will dictate some of the storm water projects.

Mr. Seeds questioned if this includes the \$1 million in the budget for 2013 for up to item 14. Mr. Wolfe noted that the budget for the General Improvement Fund for 2013 could not be determined until all the bills were paid for 2012. He noted that \$758,113 is budgeted for 2013 for storm water projects which will take us to number 14 on the list. Mr. Seeds noted that it includes the bond and PIB money. He questioned if it included General Fund money. Mr. Wolfe answered no, although the GF is paying off the debt.

Mr. Hopple noted that Earl Drive is his main concern and it lists a survey and base mapping, however a study was done in 1995 by the engineering firm and the recommendation was that the culvert be replaced with a larger one. He noted that the study also stated that it would not meet the 100-year storm prediction. Mr. Wolfe explained that no study was completed. He noted that an analysis of the capacity for the pipe was done at that time. He noted that this request is for base mapping and hydraulic studies to be completed in preparation for replacement of the facility in order to design it. He noted that this is much more in depth from what was done in the past where the size of the pipe will be determined and its carrying capacity. He noted that it will determine how much water goes through it and that it was undersized. He noted that this will allow the engineering and design to be completed for future construction. Mr. Hopple noted that the report stated that the replacement of the culvert would lower the flood waters 2.5 to 3 feet lower and it would have never damaged our properties along the creek. Mr.

Wolfe noted that each project has an affect on private property, and it needs to be determined how much the pipes are undersized over the useful life in age and what affect it would have on the transportation network. He noted that the Board understands what Mr. Hopple is faced with and he is not alone in this. Mr. Hopple noted that he is not alone but he has been coming to meetings since 1994 and it isn't getting any better only worse. He noted if you replace it, it would take some time, and it might not be done until 2014; however some of the recommendations from the engineer such as an overflow pipe could have been a cheaper fix.

Mr. Seeds questioned what the \$28,000 would cover for this project. Mr. Wolfe noted that it will do a study to prepare the design. Mr. Seeds questioned if it would tell the Board if a larger pipe would fix the problem. Mr. Wolfe noted that it won't tell you anything, it is preparing to design the replacement facility, noting if you take this step you are replacing that pipe, and it won't be done in 2013, but this is the ground work for the design for replacement. He noted that we need to determine the upstream area and from that they will size the pipe and that will determine the type of facility to be built. He noted then you would do a complete design of the facility. Mr. Seeds questioned if this will correct the problem. Mr. Wolfe noted that an engineer will tell you what they believe the size of the pipe has to be given the upstream area. Mr. Matt Miller noted that a Hydrology & Hydraulic (H&H) Study is a very detailed study, requiring survey cross sections at specific points along the stream both upstream and downstream from the culvert. He noted that the Hydrology determines where the rain is coming from, how much rain there is, how quickly it is getting from point A to point B; whereas Hydraulics determines how the stream channel in its existing condition can move said water, what impacts are in its way, such as dams or confined stream channels, structures such as bridges and culverts, and it also analyzes what we call the tail water condition. He noted if you have a huge opening so big, if there is a constriction in the channel 20 feet down from the end of the pipe, it creates tail water which is a backing up of the system.

Mr. Wolfe noted that you don't spend this money unless you plan to replace the pipe. He noted that it is the first step in pipe replacement. Mr. Seeds questioned if this would have to be done. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mr. Miller noted that it must be done to get the permit to do the project as it will require a permit. Mr. Seeds questioned how long it would take to do this. Mr. Miller answered that it takes a couple months to complete it. He noted that review and approval

for the permit aspect can be a lengthy process. Mr. Hawk noted that this is a study to tell us what we need to do to correct the problem. Mr. Miller noted that it will provide a snapshot, in time, based on the rainfall data that is currently used, what the conditions are for each year storm, breaking it down into two, five, ten, fifteen, fifty and one hundred year storms. He noted it will show what is there, what should be done to remedy it and provide a probable cost estimate. Mr. Seeds questioned who would do it. Mr. Wolfe answered HRG. Mr. Seeds noted that just because we spent the money doesn't mean that we will replace the pipe. Mr. Wolfe noted that it doesn't mean that the Board has obligated itself to replace the pipe but if you don't do that then you have wasted \$28,000.

Mr. Wolfe explained, years ago, the Township designed a traffic signal for Linglestown but it was never built and it paid for the design work. He noted if you don't do it, you've wasted the money. He noted that this is not the same as what was done before. He noted that the prior study was a determination if the facility met its needs. He noted that it was a quick report to say that it was undersized, but from that you can't design anything. He noted that you need the H&H study to begin the design phase. Mr. Seeds noted if we move forward with this study, we should be committed to replace the culvert. He explained that he wanted to replace that pipe many years ago but if this is the process, and it looks like we will do it, we are moving forward.

Mr. Wolfe noted that staff has provided a prioritized list, and has shown the projects that can be done next year, being one through 14, but we need to discuss how the Board will fund projects 15 through 33. He noted that storm water projects in 2013 have been budgeted for and allocated. He noted after that the bonds and PIB funds have been spent, the Township is out of funds however there might be a little money from the General Fund, but not millions of dollars. He noted that the Board is undertaking a bond issue at this time to refund existing debt; you could incur additional debt at that time to provide funds for 2014 and 2015.

Mr. Hopple noted that Mr. Miller noted how it narrows; he noted that this channel has a 500 foot backwash and that is pretty bad. He suggested that an overflow pipe would be good to install.

Mr. Seeds noted that it would take another \$750,000 to complete the rest of the list except for the two projects that total \$2 million.

Mr. Blain noted that there is \$5 million in the General Fund reserve and \$2.5 million dollars of outstanding debt... Mr. Wolfe suggested that it might be closer to \$4.5 million of outstanding debt as that was before the Board borrowed the money. Mr. Blain noted for an equity standpoint the Board would be a in position to pay the debt as we have more General Fund reserves than we have debt. He noted if you wanted to borrow for these projects you would have some room to do so and not impact the budget.

Mr. Crissman noted that the amount to borrow is questionable as the Board has another major issue to resolve that may have a direct affect on this.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would confirm the outstanding debt, just the Township debt, not the Friendship Center debt.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the projects that will be contained in the 2013 budget are one through 14, about \$700,000 worth of spending that is contained in the General Improvement Fund. He noted that future Board discussions on budget with the Financial Advisor and Bond Counsel will determine if the Board wants to borrow new money and how much it will be have in January when staff works to refund the \$10 million note. He noted for the General Improvement Budget there is a \$15,000 unfunded liability which he has to resolve. He noted that other than that, the General Improvement Fund budget is complete and contains the other items previously discussed such as the municipal building roof, financial management system, beginning the engineering for the Jonestown Road Bridge replacement, Public Works radio system, Wolfersberger Park Planning project and other minor items.

Mr. Blain questioned if these project would be done. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mr. Blain noted that we have to do the financial management system in 2013.

Final review of the proposed 2013 Township budgets

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would present a balanced budget as it is required for General Fund expenditures and from the last workshop session, he made some minor changes as the Local Services Tax (LST) was under budget therefore he was able to increase the expected revenue by \$35,000. He explained that he decreased the EMS contribution by \$100,000, taking that line item to zero based upon our discussions at the last meeting. He noted that he decreased the debt service based upon the projection of the financial advisor on the refunding of the 2006

debt. He noted that he increased the Township's LOSAP's contribution in accordance with the actuarial evaluation by \$16,000. He noted that the net change from the prior budget was \$175,548 and the budget is now balanced however he has a \$15,000 General Improvement Fund deficit that must be made up.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board adopted the Lower Paxton Township Authority Capital Fund and Operating Fund at the meeting of the Authority on November 20, 2012. He noted on November 27th, the Board had a workshop on the Friendship Center and at that meeting staff was directed to prepare a balanced budget removing capital projects that could not be funded. He noted that the operating fund for the Friendship Center is balanced at \$2,128,023 with some capital activities, in the range of \$95,000 from the Capital Fund and \$7,000 from the cash fund, leaving a year-end estimate of balanced funds at the Friendship Center of \$70,000 between the two accounts.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the General Fund is \$18,371,781 with Liquid Fuels budgeted at \$1,114,778, with a General Improvement Fund budget of \$1,607,615 and the FC Operating Fund at \$2,128,023 and cash estimates for the Friendship Center Capital and Operating Fund. He noted that the Board approved the Authority Capital and Operating Funds and there will be one minor change for presentation before the Board meeting on December 18, 2012.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the Township is having any problems getting the proper LST distribution of the funds as Swatara Township is having issues with discrepancies for addresses for residents. Mr. Wolfe noted that he is not aware of any. Mr. Hawk noted that it is a matter of a PSA number for where they work. Mr. Wolfe noted that he is not aware of any issues. Mr. Hawk noted that Swatara Township made a big issue out of it during the last Dauphin County Tax Collection Committee meeting. He noted that their LST is down significantly. Mr. Wolfe questioned how did they determined that it was an address issue as they are not collecting the tax. Mr. Hawk noted that it was Keystone's input. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township is down as well, but it is starting to see a rebound, and part of the issue was the change of tax collectors. He noted that he has not seen normalcy in LST or EIT in three years or longer. Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Cornell felt that it was heading for much greater deficits than what he anticipated and it could be due to the change in tax collectors.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the \$100,000 for the FC is from the refloating of the bonds. Mr. Wolfe answered that you proposed to restructure their debt. Mr. Blain noted that it is part of the refunding. Mr. Seeds questioned if we are extending the debt payment. Mr. Wolfe answered yes, noting when you restructure debt you extend it over a longer period of time. Mr. Seeds questioned for how long. Mr. Wolfe noted that has not been determined but it would probably be another five years. Mr. Seeds questioned if it was an estimate to use \$100,000. Mr. Wolfe answered that was the figure supplied to him by Mr. Wenger. He explained that Mr. Wenger and Mr. Smida are working on that refunding.

Mr. Hopple questioned if Lower Paxton Township owns the FC. Mr. Blain answered that it is part of the General Fund and we own the building and land. Mr. Hopple noted that originally the people supported with the thought that they could make it through by their membership dues and stuff like that, but he figured that they couldn't and the Township took it over. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Hopple is going back to the very beginning of the project. He noted when the project was first proposed to the Township, it was proposed by the Harrisburg East Senior Citizens Action Committee (HESCAC) as a Senior Center. He noted that the representatives came to the Board and stated that they couldn't create a functional operating Senior Center, and suggested that it should be a community center and that the Township should be involved in the project and that is when the Township became involved in the project.

Mr. Seeds noted that HESCAC was told that the Board would not just support a senior center and that it has to be a community center and for everyone. Mr. Hopple suggested that we put a lot of money in the FC. Mr. Wolfe noted by the original proposal, the plan was for the Township to contribute \$100,000 per year in lieu of rent for the Parks and Recreation Department. He noted that rate has stayed the same, but the rest of the budget for the FC comes from membership and programs. Mr. Seeds questioned what the end of the year balance would be. Mr. Wolfe answered that it is projected at \$4,944,289. He noted that the end of the year numbers are coming in a little better than expected. Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Wolfe took the \$100,000 from the EMS budget... Mr. Wolfe noted that it would not affect that budget. He explained that it comes from the spend for 2013 which was used to balance the budget in 2013, however, the money we have on account for the General Fund is about \$5 million and the budget for next year is balanced at \$18,371,781. He noted to balance that budget he reduced his

expenditure for EMS by \$100,000. Mr. Seeds questioned if something else was added that was not in the budget before. Mr. Wolfe answered that he increased LST by \$35,000; decreased the EMS contribution of \$100,000; decreased the debt service by \$56,548 using an estimate provided by Susquehanna Municipal Advisors; and increased LOSAP by \$16,000. Mr. Seeds noted that we had a balance budget a month or two ago. Mr. Wolfe noted that the budget was out of balance by \$175,000. He noted that the budget was 95% done, but until we had the meeting on November 5, we were unable to balance the budget until we knew what changes there would be. He noted since that point in time he was able to balance the budget.

Mr. Seeds noted that it looks like we will move forward on Earl Drive as Mr. Hople is here to know what will be done about that. He suggested that the Board may decide to borrow money to do more work. He noted that there was a request by the fire companies for additional funds, namely one in particular for more funds. Mr. Wolfe noted that we have not given them a direct increase in cash contribution however we are giving them an additional \$16,000 for the LOSAP and another \$35,000 for workers compensation coverage, and between the two items, it accounts for \$50,000 more in 2013. Mr. Seeds noted that it is not money to run their fire companies.

Mr. Blain noted if it was a regular business, noting that it would be no different from making a pension contribution and paying insurance, so in his mind it actually is money to run the fire company. Mr. Seeds noted that he is not proposing to give them more money or to raise the fire tax, but they will want an answer. Mr. Wolfe noted that it will not satisfy them immediately but you are giving a significant amount of money to the fire companies on an annual basis.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the budget would be ready for December 18th meeting. Mr. Wolfe answered yes.

Mr. Blain noted that he is looking at Mr. Luetchford's memo dated December 6th, that states the he eliminated numerous items such as window cleaning and the anniversary celebration; however he is concerned with removing the building HVAC management. Mr. Luetchford noted that it is the electronic controls for the rooftop units, the electronic controls for the HVAC, to include the pool pac units as well. He noted that he was told by the HVAC persons that it would cost around \$80,000 to fix the situation, but we could probably do the same job for

\$40,000. Mr. Blain noted that when you mentioned that it would be reduced, are you saying that the amount in the budget would be reduced but you still plan to do that project. Mr. Luetchford answered that the \$40,000 is still included in the budget. Mr. Blain noted that you have eliminated office carpet repair, seal and striping the parking lot, and replastering the lap pool. Mr. Crissman noted that the \$19,000 for replastering the pool, if it is not done and is delayed another year, the pool will get worse and it will cost more to repair it. Mr. Luetchford noted that is a potential problem. Mr. Blain noted that he is more concerned that about what you plan to do in 2014 through 2016 to stabilize the operations, and put it into the black. He noted especially when it comes to capital improvements. He noted the replastering of the lap pool is budgeted at \$18,800 that will be eliminated this year but the future cost may go up. He questioned if the lap pool makes money for the FC; he noted if it shows profitability then it might not be something that we want to eliminate and we should fix it now. He noted that it goes back to his point of what he made in the beginning in that to feel comfortable to approve any budget for the FC; he needs to understand what areas in the FC are profitable and what are not.

Mr. Wolfe noted that we are working with items that are not on the same time frame. He explained that he spoke with Mr. Wenger and sent him the proposed budget and capital plan and he will provide the Board with insight for a proposal on determining cost centers within the FC. He noted that we have also discussed determining cost centers by conducting our own survey of user ship, continuing users, and doing member surveys. He noted that we understand that this Board wants us to determine cost centers for what makes money and what does not make money. He explained that he won't be able to have that done by December 18th when the budget is adopted but his expectation is that we will continue discussion about FC into January with a potential to add additional debt for some of the capital projects. He noted that he hopes to have a financial analysis for the cost centers at the FC in order to determine where we need to spend the money to get the biggest bang for the buck. Mr. Blain questioned if he could help in any way with this. Mr. Wolfe answered, when he gets the information back from Mr. Wenger he will provide it to Mr. Blain.

Mr. Blain noted that there are only two things of value at the FC, the revenue stream or the value of the building. He questioned what would be the item that someone would want to buy, the best use of the building, and the building value or the revenue stream. He noted that he

does not know this information at this time and it would help to make future decisions as to what to do in regards to capital improvements to the building. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Wenger is providing a proposal and Mr. Luetchford has also reached out to Mr. Ballard but he noting that he is not looking at the recreation viewpoint but the dollars and cents viewpoint. Mr. Blain noted that it will help to determine, for the long term, where the center is going and what is to be done from the Township's perspective. He noted that we don't want this to be an asset that is not an income generator, and we need to determine what to do with this asset to make it generate income. Mr. Wolfe noted that you don't want to put money in a pool shell if the pool is not a money maker. He suggested that we must think the replastering through because if we find out that the lap pool is one of the bigger profit makers, then we better find the money to replace the pool shell soon.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he has prepared a budget to maintain operations for 2013 and the rest of the discussions will be held in the beginning of next year.

Mr. Seeds noted at the end of 2013, there will be no funds in the capital improvement fund. Mr. Luetchford noted that it is almost depleted. Mr. Hornung suggested that when we last spoke we were going to determine what would be required to turn the FC into a more profitable entity with the assumption that we would borrow money if it was necessary to be able to achieve that. He noted that it will take some analysis to determine where the profit centers are and where we should invest the money. He noted that there is a willingness of the Board to take out a loan if necessary to make it more profitable to keep it running. Mr. Blain noted to enhance the revenue and income stream.

Mr. Seeds noted that the seniors are not providing the same income as they did years ago since they are using the health care memberships. He noted that the revenue is down due to government programs. Mr. Luetchford noted that the insurance companies are not paying the same amount. He noted the service provided to the seniors costs more than what is received in the membership fees paid by the insurance companies. He suggested that it is a loss of income in the amount of \$120,000 for senior memberships.

Mr. Hornung questioned what our expectation for next year is at this time is. Mr. Wolfe answered that he has a desire to identify the cost centers to come up with a means to increase revenues from those cost centers and program our capital needs to address issues in those cost

centers. He noted in doing all of that we will have increased revenue and be breaking even which is what we need to do. He noted that it includes covering the capital replacement plan which is an additional \$170,000 per year. Mr. Seeds noted that there is no money to put into that fund.

Mr. Hornung questioned if we could have a bond in place by next year at this time to spending those funds. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mr. Hornung questioned if we will be able to identify those areas that we want to invest in... Mr. Wolfe answered that is the hard part, but putting the bond together and doing the bid to get the project done is the easy part. Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Wolfe when he thought he would have that information. Mr. Wolfe answered that he is waiting for Mr. Wenger to tell us what he believes it would cost and what he can do in that process. He noted when he gets that proposal he will be able to determine if there are things that staff can do, and he would bring it to the Board to discuss with Mr. Wenger. He stated that he would like to have that meeting during the first meeting in January.

Mr. Hornung questioned, as you put the projects on hold, what impact does it have on customer satisfaction and membership. Mr. Wolfe noted the longer we wait the harder it is to make it up at the end of the year. Mr. Hornung noted once you lose a member it is much harder to get them back.

“Otta Know” Presentation: Act 73 of 2012 – use of Authority Funds

Mr. Stine noted that this is an amendment to the Authorities Act stating that Authorities are to spend the money that they get from sewer revenues on sewer type projects and not to do other things that are not sewer related. He noted if you don't do it that way, you are subject to litigation from rate payers.

Mr. Hawk questioned if you could put a payment schedule into effect that would be satisfactory. Mr. Stine answered no as the Authority is not to loan money or give money to other things; although there are a list of exceptions, and limitations. He noted that the Township is not a lending institution and neither is the Authority.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Blain seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 8:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman
Township Secretary