

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop June 10, 2014

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

Supervisors present in addition to Mr. Crissman were: William C. Seeds, Sr., William L. Hornung, and Robin L. Lindsey.

Also in attendance was George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steve Stine, Township Attorney; Christine Hunter, H. Edward Black and Associates; Brian Luetchford, Parks and Recreation Director; and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

**Pledge of Allegiance**

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

**Public Comment**

No public comment was provided.

Presentation of Proclamation – CASA U13 Boys Premier Team

Mr. Crissman asked the Board members to join him at the podium along with Mr. Chinapoo, Mr. David Blain and members of the CASA U13 Boys Premier Team.

Mr. Crissman read the proclamation: Whereas, the Capital Area Soccer Association (CASA) is one of the largest youth soccer programs in Pennsylvania; and Whereas, CASA boasts over 2,600 recreational players, 360 travel players, and 215 premier players; and Whereas, the CASA Under 13 Boys Premier travel soccer team won the 2014 Presidents Cup for the Eastern Region of the United States; and Whereas, the CASA Under 13 Boys Premier travel soccer team will represent the 16-state Eastern Region at the Presidents Cup National Soccer Championship in South Carolina in July 2014; and Whereas, CASA has never has never had a team compete in the Presidents Cup tournament; and Whereas, the US Youth Soccer Presidents Cup is designed for those teams seeking additional challenges to play against teams of similar abilities for a national title; and Whereas, the Presidents Cup provides a progressive, competitive experience, highlighting camaraderie and community from the state to regional to national levels of US Youth Soccer. Now therefore, we, the Board of Supervisors, join the 47,360 residents of Lower Paxton Township in recognizing the significant accomplishments of the CASA Under 13

Boys Premier travel soccer team, and we wish this team the best of luck as it competes for the Presidents Cup National Soccer Championship in South Carolina in July 2014.

Mrs. Lindsey presented the plaque to the team.

Mr. David Blain, 1197 Knacklyn Farms Court, Harrisburg, explained that he is the Vice-President for CASA and Eric Vital is the President of the CASA. He noted that Richard Chinapoo is the outgoing Technical Director as he is moving to Florida. He noted that Mr. Chinapoo is the coach of this team and at this time he would invite Mr. Chinapoo to explain what the President's Cup is all about.

Mr. Richard Chinapoo, 4108 Lisa Drive, noted that he has been involved with CASA for over 17 years and has had a good working relationship with Mr. Luetchford. He noted that the journey started with this team when the boys were ten or eleven, noting that the idea is that the kids have fun, and along the way, learn the game. He noted that it took a month for the kids to understand his crazy philosophy. He noted that he enjoys what he does and he wants it to be that way for the kids as well. He explained that they progressed over the years, becoming a regular travel teaming going to tournaments and some of them wanted to become more serious even though they played other sports, noting that they gave up those sports for soccer. He noted that he stressed grades with the boys and they had to maintain their grades noting that all the boys are above a 90% average. He noted that the parents' are very supportive of the team, and he has a very good relationship between the boys, the parents, and the club and that is unique.

Mr. Chinapoo noted that he cares for the boys on the field and off the field. He explained that you will not win every game, so at this point, in the spring since most of the boys played school ball he did not want to overload them with a league. He noted that the President's Cup would guarantee them four games. He explained that the team did well and moved to the finals. He noted they then went to Region 1; and this is the first time he coached a Region 1 team. He noted that it was hot and playing from the first game to the fifth, the team gave 100%. He noted that that boys studied the game and they care for each other and challenge each other, a true concept of what a team is supposed to be. He noted that it is a foundation for a successful team.

Mr. Chinapoo noted that they have not received the schedule yet, but he will have eight morning sessions in the morning to get use to the South Carolina weather. He noted that it is a great honor to represent Lower Paxton Township in Region 1. He noted that the boys are excited

but he will keep them calm. He noted that it is a wonderful experience for the boys and he thanked everyone for the support given to CASA.

Mr. Crissman thanked Mr. Chinapoo and told him that he expects him to bring the trophy home.

Review of the preliminary construction plans  
for the Heroes Grove Memorial and Amphitheater

Mr. Luetchford noted that Christine Hunter, from H. Edward Black and Associates has worked in cooperation with the Heroes Grove Committee in preparing plans for the Heroes Grove Amphitheater. He noted that Ms. Hunter wanted to explain the preliminary construction plans to the Board during this meeting.

Ms. Christine Hunter noted that she represents Heroes Grove and explained that the Committee has secured many grants providing funding for Phase I budget of \$760,000. She noted that she has been working with the Committee, Taskforce and Mr. Luetchford to prepare construction documents for the amphitheater and she hopes to submit this to the Township for its review within the next few weeks. She noted that she is waiting for plans from an electrical engineer.

Ms. Hunter noted that the Board is familiar with the design for the amphitheater and Mr. Wolfe showed the overall view of the project. Ms. Hunter noted that the plan shows that the current Skate Rink will be converted to handicap parking. She noted that an asphalt trail will be provided from that area to the amphitheater. She noted that the amphitheater is circular with a concrete walk going down to the stage with some seat walls, lighting and landscaping.

Mr. Crissman questioned what the status was for parking with the shopping center. Ms. Hunter noted that she was hoping to have an agreement by now. She noted that the owner is working with the Township with some development issues, adding some uses, and working with the Township on parking requirements. She noted that concurring she was contacting them about a proposed agreement to allow people who are attending a Heroes Grove event to park vehicles in the shopping center. She noted that the shopping center was able to resolve their issues with the Township and staff determined that it would allow Heroes Grove to use some parking spaces as it would not impact their overall parking count, as it would be considered a temporary use since it is not a constant use. She noted that they indicated to her that they plan to come forward with an agreement for Heroes Grove in two and a half weeks but she has not seen anything yet.

She explained that she feels much better about it than she did before; however she does not have the actual signed agreement. Mr. Crissman noted that he hopes that Ms. Hunter does not wait until the Board meets with her again, asking that as soon as she gets an agreement to please let Mr. Wolfe know.

Mr. Hornung questioned what would happen if they say no to the parking; what is the backup plan. Ms. Hunter answered that the backup plan is for the participants to park in Brightbill Park. She noted when the Township has concerts now, they park in Brightbill Park.

Mr. Hornung questioned if we would need additional pathways to accommodate the backup plan. Ms. Hunter answered that she would have to look at that. Mr. Hornung questioned if we had an agreement and the shopping center was sold would it carry through to the new owners. Ms. Hunter answered that the agreements are documents that Mr. Stine drafted about a year ago and they were made with Cedar Reality Trust. She suggested that they were drafted in such a way that they would stand.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if parking would be available at the Friendship Center. Ms. Hunter answered that it was not considered as an option since they don't want to take parking from the members. Ms. Lindsey suggested that there is no way to prohibit people from parking at the Friendship Center.

Mr. Crissman thanked Ms. Hunter for the update and he explained that he hoped to have the next update provided sooner than this one with perhaps some good news.

Mr. Seeds noted that the groundbreaking for the Heroes Grove should be addressed. Ms. Hunter noted that it will be held on Saturday, July 5<sup>th</sup> along with a parade and community festival.

Mr. Wolfe questioned what the construction schedule is. Ms. Hunter answered that the goal is to be under construction this fall, noting that the requirement of one of the County's grants is that it must be used by March of 2014. She explained that they received a six month extension which would take the project to September. She noted that she does not think they will be able to meet that deadline and suspects that she will have to ask for another extension. She noted that the goal is to bid the project by the end of the summer with the start of construction in late fall or early spring.

Ms. Lindsey noted if you go to the website for Heroes Grove, you can purchase bricks in memory or honor of a loved one for military, police or ambulance service providers. She noted you can also contact the Township for the information

Discussion regarding necessary  
maintenance at Hodges Heights Park

Mr. Luetchford explained that he had some pictures to share with the Board in regards to the conditions of the Hodges Heights Park. He noted that the park was established in the 1970's on top of the Township landfill. He explained that the landfill has experienced significant ground settling over time as the trash underneath decomposes, and the permanent structures, to include the pavilion and basketball and tennis courts are affected by the movement of the ground. He noted, as a result that has speeded up the decay of those facilities. He noted that the photo shows the tennis court lighting poles leaning, showing significant erosion on the south end as it is eroding away the base of the tennis court. He noted that the tennis court is not level, it is very wavy and the concrete is raised at the area of the net. He noted that the post was removed. He explained that there is cracking and erosion on the other side of the tennis court as well. He noted that the tennis court was paved over a couple of times in order to try to level it but it is back to it's previous condition. He noted there is a sinkhole in the tennis court about the size of his fist.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the pavilion is leaning heavily to the right and it has been doing that for decades. He noted that they built a wooded platform under the concrete 20 years ago but it is waving as well.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the playground equipment has been around for about ten years and is in decent shape. He noted that it is aging, but it is quite straight and usable. He noted that there are swings and the wooden fire truck is still usable.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the tennis court is unplayable and the pavilion is leaning to the right and is usable but he would not recommend doing so for much longer due to the leaning. He noted that the play equipment is in decent shape but the basketball courts are also starting to exhibit some significant waving but the posts are still upright. He noted in the course of the next few years it will continue to degrade.

Mr. Luetchford noted that his recommendation is to remove the tennis courts and make it a grass area. He noted that due to the subsidence from the landfill, the park is not conducive to

permanent structures. He noted that structures will continue to be a maintenance problem throughout and if rebuilt, they will continue to be a maintenance problem as it will not end. He noted that he would consider moving some of the other permanent pieces as they become unusable, with the pavilion the next item to be removed.

Mr. Luetchford suggested planning a park, noting that we don't want to take away structures and just leave it grass. He suggested that the ball field area could be filled in and grass planted. He noted that we need to discuss what we want to continue to do in the future for that area, but in the short term remove the tennis court and consider future work and what the plans would be for this park.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if many people use the park. Mr. Luetchford answered not many as people don't know that it exists. He noted that the neighbors use it lightly, but he has received phone calls about the condition of the playground. He noted that he saw someone walking their dog while he was there and some people use the pavilion so there are users. He noted someone plays ball occasionally.

Ms. Lindsey noted that Mr. Luetchford is asking to remove the tennis court and also requested to remove the pavilion in the future. She questioned if it is safe to let it remain in its current condition. Mr. Luetchford answered that it is not in danger of collapsing but it is leaning and unsightly. He noted that it will continue to lean more and at some point it will become unsafe to use. He noted the same situation occurred to the fencing that was installed in the area as it became wavy and unstable over time.

Mr. Hornung questioned if Mr. Luetchford suggests that it would not need concrete or macadam. Mr. Luetchford noted that there are not many children in the neighborhood from what he could see and he would like to work with the community to see what they want. He noted other than a few people sitting under the pavilion, walking dogs and few children playing in the playground, little else is done there. He suggested that it might be good to make it a natural area by creating walking paths using gravel and not paving it. He noted that it would be a simple green natural area that could be used by the public in passive ways other than an active sport area. He noted that sports activities generally require public structures.

Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Luetchford how long it would take to do an assessment of the areas and bringing in people to discuss what should be done. Mr. Luetchford answered, in the past, the Parks and Recreation Board has met with the public to plan areas. He noted that

Lamplight Park was a good example with the people meeting multiple times with the neighborhood over the course of six months to determine an appropriate way to plan the park. He noted that a similar schedule might be good for the Parks and Recreation Board noting that by wintertime it could have a general idea of how this park might be planned.

Mr. Crissman noted that staff would need to do the assessment, meet with the community to lay out a plan and this would occur during the time when the Board is heavily active with budget discussions. He questioned what the footprint would look like for the park as it would have to be a budget consideration. He noted once the Parks and Recreation Board come up with a cost for the park layout they will make a recommendation to the Board for it to endorse to come up with a budget. Mr. Luetchford noted that the meetings with the neighborhood would take about six months and the planning process would take significantly longer. He suggested that it would not be ready for the 2015 budget.

Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Luetchford suggested that the Parks and Recreation Board would meet with the community that lives there, but he questioned if the children who play at the park walk to that location as opposed to driving, parking and taking advantage of the opportunities. He questioned if that is an accurate assessment. Mr. Luetchford answered yes as it would be a neighborhood park and not a community park. He noted that the other question becomes if the Board wants to build a park on a landfill.

Mr. Seeds noted that he visited the site this weekend and he thought Mr. Luetchford stated that the tennis courts should be removed this year. Mr. Luetchford answered yes. Mr. Seeds noted that there are two to three inch cracks in the tennis courts and they are getting worse. He noted that the one lighting pole could fall on a cable line noting that the one light standard on the east side that is next to the basketball court could be used for lighting for the basketball court. He noted that pole appears to be upright and vertical. He questioned if that light standard could be saved when removing the tennis court and other light standard. He suggested that the ball field could use some fill in the low spots. He noted that the pavilion would be okay for a while. He noted that we need to think about the long term needs for this park.

Mr. Crissman noted that we have to do something immediately when it comes to health and safety issues. Mr. Luetchford noted that there are potentials now for tripping hazards and the light pole falling and they need to be taken care of now.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there is a consensus of the Board to remove the tennis courts this year and make the necessary repairs.

Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Luetchford had a specific recommendation for remediation for removal of structures at this point so the Board can reach consensus and provide direction to staff. Mr. Luetchford noted that he would like to do this in a short and long-term manner, immediately taking care of the safety hazard at the tennis court making it a grass area and then engaging the community for the long-term plans for the future with the Parks and Recreation Board.

Mr. Crissman noted that the immediate request is to remove the tennis courts. Mr. Luetchford answered yes. Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Luetchford should move forward with the long term action plan.

Mr. Jack Sariano, 896 Country Lake Drive, stated that he lives in the Sunnyhill Development and he explained that he goes to that park every day at various times of the day. He noted that he drives his great grandson to the park and many other people in the area drive their children to that location around noon time or early afternoon. He noted that it probably would get more use if the safety issues had been taken care of. He noted that many kids play ball in the area but due to the subsidence it is not attractive and it could be a safety issue. He noted that there has been a lot of development in that area with families who have young children and he stated that he was sure that the park would get a lot of use at some point in time if staff took care of some of these issues. He noted that the tennis court is a hazard and he was glad to see that the fencing was removed and that the Township is starting to remove the tennis courts. He noted that he played tennis many times at that location in the distant past but you can't do that anymore. He noted that he appreciates anything that the Board could do to bring that park up to standards and to make it usable. He noted that he is glad to see that the Township is moving in that direction.

Mr. Crissman noted if we have consensus from the Board he would ask Mr. Luetchford to move forward to clean up the health and safety issues and to move forward with the planning process.

Mr. Hornung questioned who would do the work. Mr. Luetchford answered that the Public Works Department would do it. Mr. Hornung questioned if the debris would be taken to the fill site at Wolfersberger Park. Mr. Luetchford answered that he did not know. Mr. Crissman

noted that it would make sense. Mr. Wolfe noted that the site is not ready to receive fill yet but he did not think it would be a tremendous amount of material to remove. He noted that the idea is to take away the hazard but it won't produce more than three or more truckloads of debris.

Mr. Hornung questioned when Public Works would do the work. Mr. Luetchford answered if they check their schedule they may start it this month. Mr. Hornung questioned if anything could be done in the meantime as it looks very dangerous. Mr. Luetchford noted that he could put up a caution tape around the area until the work is completed.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if there have been any incidents that occurred on the tennis courts. Mr. Luetchford answered no. Mr. Seeds noted in his observation, it is not that bad yet. Ms. Lindsey noted that there is a drop off issue on the other side. Mr. Seeds noted that it would be easy to turn an ankle on the ball field.

Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Luetchford has received direction to move forward with the recommendation.

#### Review of the results from the Friendship Center user survey

Mr. Wolfe noted that part of the efforts of staff and the Friendship Center Operation Board (FCOB) is to move forward with a strategic plan to improve the Friendship Center (FC). He noted that it was determined that a user's survey was necessary in that staff did not want to make improvements that would not be desired by those that use the facility. He noted that the Board members viewed the actual survey during a previous meeting and he now has partial results to review with the Board this evening.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there were 700 respondents which was a significant number of those who use the facility. He noted that the survey was completed by members, guests, and program participants. He noted that Mr. Luetchford will run through the survey attempting to answer any questions the Board may have.

Mr. Luetchford explained that there were 20 questions.

He noted Question One asked, "I am a resident of:" He noted that 66% answered that they were residents of the Township while 24% responded that they were from neighboring Townships, with 10% answering other.

Question Two: "I am:" He noted that 70% indicated that they were female and 30% answered that they were male. He noted in many instances mothers bring their children to the programs offered by the FC and many parents responded to the surveys.

Question Three: "I am:" He noted that the average respondent was 50 years old, noting that many respondents were parents or senior citizens.

Question Four: "I have been a FC member for the following number of years:" He noted that 30% responded that they were members for less than two years, 14% from three to five years; 26% for six plus years and 30% were not members. Mr. Wolfe noted that the three to five year answer would coincide with the recession and down turn in the local economy. He noted that the last two years have been good for the local economy and you can see that there has been a significant number of memberships in the last two years and those who have been with the FC for a long time and value their membership are represented in the six plus year category. Mr. Luetchford noted that the senior health memberships have added to memberships over the past few years.

Question Five: "My membership type is:" Family membership - 35%; Adult Couples – 9%; Adult Singles - 17%; Single Parent Family – 5%; Senior Single – 19%; Senior Couple – 13% and Youth/Student – 1.6%. Mr. Luetchford noted that families overall are in the 40% range.

Question Six: "My membership is through my health insurance provider:" Mr. Luetchford noted that 82% answered no but the health insurance memberships equal roughly half of the memberships noting that this answered reflects answered from many program recipients who are not members of the FC.

Question Seven: "I am a member of the Friendship Senior Center:" He noted that 93% answered no and 7% answered yes.

Question Eight: "Which statement best describes your opinion regarding membership rates: Check only one:" Mr. Luetchford noted that 39% indicated that membership rates are reasonable. He noted that 12% indicated that the rates provide a significant value for the dollar. He noted that 22% indicated that the membership is more than our local fitness facilities while 26% stated that the membership costs too much.

Question Nine: "I use the following facilities at the FC: Check all that apply!:" He noted that the natatorium dominated this by 67% with Cardio equipment – 54%; Weight machines – 40%, noting that these two categories along with the functional equipment at 7% could be added together to outweigh the natatorium numbers. He noted that the functional equipment could be added to the Cardio and Weight responses. He noted that the gymnasium, classrooms and babysitting are also used.

Question Ten: “I participate in the following FC programs: Check all that apply:” Mr. Luetchford noted that 36% noted that they did not participate in any programs, while 34% participated in swimming programs. He noted that the dance classes and functional classes are mainly held in the gym but some are held in the classrooms as well. He noted that the mind and body classes are also held in the classrooms as well. He noted that swimming dominates since the FC has such a popular swim program.

Question Eleven: “Which statement best describes your opinion regarding rates for programs: Check only one:” Mr. Luetchford noted that 34% stated that the program rates were reasonable, 39% felt that the cost of membership should include programs at no additional cost while 13% felt that program rates provide significant value for the activity offered. He noted that 6% felt that the cost of the programs was more than local fitness facilities and 8% felt that the programs cost too much. Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the programs were included in the membership fees if it would bring in more members. Mr. Luetchford noted that it is the general belief and he has been counseled to do that by the national consultant. He noted that to be in the marketplace the FC will have to provide the type of services demanded by the public and many people want selective programs offered as part of their membership.

Question Twelve: “The FC may add exercise activities in the Social Hall and /or Classrooms. If activities were added, which would you prefer? Rank in priority order: highest -1, lowest – 6.” Mr. Luetchford noted that 40% want more cardio equipment, 13% functional fitness equipment; 16% want more weight machines and free weights; 24% want a climbing wall, 23% want fitness classroom space and 44% listed other. He noted that there is a wide variety of requests from those who took the survey. He noted that the highest requests are for fitness equipment and that is what he has been told before; to expand the fitness center. Mr. Hornung questioned those who answered other, did they write in suggestions. Mr. Luetchford answered that there were hundreds of comments and he is sifting through those now, noting that the largest number of responses was to look for having a membership including classes.

Question Thirteen: “The FC is investigating the conversion of classrooms into space for programs. Which programs are of most interest to you: Check no more than three:” Mr. Luetchford answered that mind and body (Yoga, Pilates, Yogalataes, TaiChi) had 40%, followed by 30% for aerobics, 24% dance 22% functional fitness and 15% for spinning. He noted that 7%

answered other and 31% answered that they did not participate in programs. He noted that these types of classes seem to be a significant interest to those taking the survey.

Question Fourteen: “Should the FC include select programs as part of the membership.” Mr. Luetchford noted that 78% answered yes and 22% answered no. He noted that there were 659 people who responded to this question.

Question Fifteen: “Are you willing to pay a nominal increase in membership rates if select programs are included?” He noted that 39% stated yes and 62% said no. Mr. Wolfe noted that the vast majority of people are in opposition to paying for an increase in membership fees to provide some programs.

Question Sixteen: “The FC is considering changing its hours of operation. Would you use the following changes for workouts: Check all that apply:” Mr. Luetchford noted that the FCOB had a concern about the hours of operation and decided to include this in the survey. He noted that 77% stated that the current hours adequately serve their workout needs. He noted that 20% would like the FC to open on Saturdays at 7 a.m. and 14% stated that they would like the FC to open weekdays at 5 a.m. Ms. Lindsey noted that the survey mentions Sunday morning but the chart does not include it. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Sunday morning question was answered in the comment response that needs to be totaled by hand. He noted that different options were offered for Sunday morning and it has to be totaled differently. Mr. Luetchford noted that 130 out of the 704 who took the survey would like the hours to be earlier on Sunday. He noted that the majority of the comments centered around 8 or 9 a.m. He noted that it would cost money as you need staff to do that. He noted that he needs to compare those results with the Saturday comments as well. Ms. Lindsey questioned if the FC opens on Sundays at 12 noon. Mr. Luetchford answered yes noting that it closes at 6 p.m.

Question Seventeen: “If the FC closed Saturdays at 7:00 p.m., would this change affect you.” Mr. Luetchford noted that 16% answered yes and 84% answered no. He noted that 675 people answered the question and 109 answered yes so staff must discern if this change would impact membership.

Question Eighteen: “If the FC closed Fridays at 9 p.m., would his change affect you?” Mr. Luetchford answered that 91% indicated no, and 9% indicated yes. He suggested that this may be an easy decision to make as it would not affect many people. He noted that the FCOB indicated to staff that they would like staff to continue to analyze the responses and to make

specific recommendations based upon the results of the survey. He noted that the FCOB will then come to the Board for its approval for the recommendations in the months to come.

Question Nineteen: “In the past five years, I have been a member of the following facilities:” Mr. Luetchford noted that 53% of the members have been members of the FC while 16% stated that they have been a member of Planet Fitness, and 11% have been members of LA Fitness.

Question Twenty: “I visit the FC:” He noted that over 61% of the members come to the FC multiple days of the week, with 20% coming weekly, 3% monthly and 17% infrequently. He noted that almost two-thirds of the members are multiple day visitors for the facility.

Mr. Luetchford noted that is all he had for the Board tonight as he wanted to share the survey response. He noted that the FCOB has directed staff to move forward with some of the suggestions with a potential of expanding the fitness center, retrofitting classrooms for more fitness classes and staff is working to implement on-line registration for classes.

Ms. Lindsey questioned how many members belong to the FC. Mr. Luetchford answered over 2,400 memberships. Mr. Wolfe noted as part of the Key Indicator Report at the end of the agenda, he will display the membership chart.

Ms. Lindsey questioned how many surveys were completed on-line and how many were hard copies. Mr. Wolfe answered that 80% were completed on-line.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Luetchford found any surprises in the survey. Mr. Luetchford answered that there was nothing terribly surprising. He expected the surveys to support what he already knew such as memberships to include some programs and that the fitness center needs to be expanded. He noted that he knows that the FC is to be self sufficient and the fitness center is the facility that he is looking to expand to make that happen. He noted that the survey supports many of staff’s previous assumptions.

Mr. Seeds noted that there were no surprises for him.

Mr. Crissman noted that the only item that surprised him was the question concerning people who were willing to pay more for programs and he did not expect it to be as high as 40%. He noted that FCOB asked staff to look at the facilities hours based upon the survey results and also the inclusion of programs with memberships. He noted that the FCOB has not received the tally of the written comments and when that is shared with the FCOB he assumed that it will also

be shared with the Board of Supervisors as well. He noted that we may be able to glean more information than what was received from the hard data.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he wanted to show a FC commercial that will air on the TV channel and webpage.

Mr. Luetchford explained that Mr. Dave Jostenski creates videos as a hobby and he approached Rachel Scott and questioned if he could make a video for the FC for free. He noted that it is a short three minute video that promotes the FC, showing many of the activities that occur at the building.

Mr. Crissman questioned if it would be on the website. Mr. Luetchford answered that it will be but now it is currently running on the Township TV channel. He noted that staff plans to put on You Tube and possibly doing other vides in the future for parks and other things that are done in the Township.

Mr. Seeds questioned how long the video is. Mr. Luetchford answered that it is three minutes. Mr. Seeds questioned if you could buy three minutes on a TV channel to show this. Mr. Luetchford answered probably not as he would expand the internet presence as the young families are looking at the internet more and more as a source of information.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the FC is involved in social media. Mr. Luetchford answered yes, noting that the FC has a Facebook site, and there are other sites that we are looking to expand into.

Ms. Diane Geise, 172 Meadowview Lane, noted that she has been a member of the FC probably before the first form was laid, and she noted that she swims at least three times a week. She explained that she has become an avid swimmer and cannot say enough good things about the FC. She noted that the people at the FC are fantastic but she would like to see fundraisers on a grand scale, not a \$10 brick here or there. She noted that she would like to serve on this type of committee to raise huge funds to help with the expansion of the center. She noted that she has ideas for fundraisers and other programs that would bring in the younger people. She explained that she does not belong to the Friendship Senior Center but that is because she has not made the effort to find out more about it. She noted that she would like to see more advertising knowing that it costs money.

Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Luetchford should make contact with Ms. Giese to discuss her ideas.

Discussion with the Meadowview Village Homeowners  
Association regarding amendments proposed to the  
Meadowview Village land development plan

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township received correspondence from Meadowview Village (MV) in regards to amendments that they are proposing for the final subdivision and land development plan for their development. He noted that these amendments are being proposed in an effort to close out the existing development which has been through various developers. He noted that the Homeowners Association (HOA) has taken control of the vast majority of the development and they are trying to close out some unfinished items from the original development.

Mr. Wolfe noted that MV proposed three things. He noted that they want two new off-street parking areas, small areas to accommodate six to eight vehicles. He noted that the purpose is to provide for overflow parking in existing areas that are without overflow parking. He noted that they proposed to remove retaining walls on Meadowview Drive and they propose to remove the pedestrian path from the plan that circled the development providing recreational opportunities to those who live there. He noted that the existing residents do not believe that it is necessary.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Diane Geise and Mary Liz Todaro are present to present the plan. Ms. Todaro distributed a packet to the Board members.

Mr. Crissman requested both parties to identify themselves. Ms. Diane Geise explained that she lives at 124 Meadowview Lane and Mary-Liz Todaro stated that she lives in Meadowview Village.

Ms. Todaro explained that they submitted a request asking for modifications to the plan on February 5, 2014. She noted that the basis for that was already mentioned by Mr. Wolfe.

Ms. Todaro noted that the ground where the retaining wall was supposed to be developed is adequately sloped at this point with the ground stabilized with growing vegetation such as Crown Vetch. She explained that this was done in 2008, and there has been no erosion with the ground being stable. She explained that she took pictures a couple of weeks ago to show that the ground was stabilized in that location. She noted that the first picture shows the ground behind Unit 187; the second page shows the bank behind Unit 188; and the third page shows the bank between two buildings and between Unit 188 and Unit 190. She noted that the diagram shows

how the units are situated as they are called quads. She noted that the two units from the one quad that face the bank are 187 and 188 as well as unit 190 from another quad. She noted that no one wants to touch it as they had not had any issues with the bank

Ms. Todaro noted that there are other issues and that is why they engaged an engineer to look at this to get his opinion on the retaining wall.

Ms. Todaro noted that the other issues that they are addressing at Units 187 and 188 do not impact the hillside as it is stable. She noted that she was asked by Township staff to get verification that the super majority of the residents, 67%, wanted to see the changes made. She noted that was presented to Mr. Wolfe on April 30, 2014 and the Association is waiting to get the approval to move on. She noted that the developer of record had agreed to put in the additional parking spaces, noting that they are needed as there is very little parking in that area and we have final paving that needs to be done and it has been put on hold since 2008. She noted that she would like to move forward with the plan to get those parking spaces in and to complete the final paving.

Mr. Seeds questioned in Mr. Wolfe's letter dated February 24, 2014 what he meant when he wrote, for an action to be taken by the Board to amend the subdivision plan, all parties to the plan of lots must participate in the plan revision. Mr. Wolfe answered in a subdivision plan that has sold lots, when the plan needs to be changed; all lot owners need to agree to the change. He noted that the Township has had plans in the past where the developer wanted to make amendments to the plan and has sold lots. He noted before the Board could approve the amendments all lot owners had to sign off on the amendment. He noted that Chelsey Falls and Old Iron Estates were two such subdivision plans. He noted in this case there are covenants that run to the HOA that state that the HOA, by super majority of the property owners can make changes to the plan. He noted that those conveyances have been reviewed by Mr. Stine and he concurs with their meaning that not all property owners need to sign off but just a super majority as indicated by the HOA conveyances. Mr. Seeds questioned if that is where the 67% come from. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mr. Seeds note that there is no 100% requirement. Mr. Wolfe answered that is correct. He noted that he was not aware of that when he wrote the February letter.

Mr. Crissman noted that you used the term super majority, he questioned if there is a different definition for supermajority as opposed to majority. Mr. Stine noted that it would be

defined in the conveyance and 67% is considered a super majority as opposed to 100% which would be a simple majority.

Ms. Todaro noted that a majority did not respond which is unusual in a 55 plus community as normally there is a lot of change in ownership as people move to nursing homes.

Mr. Crissman questioned if Ms. Todaro has the documentation. Mr. Wolfe answered that they have provided it to the Township.

Ms. Lindsey noted that she does not have a problem with the pedestrian walk or the installation of the parking spaces but she does with the removal of the retaining wall. She noted that she has visited the site and it is very steep in that location. She questioned that the original plan showed the wall and wanted to know why they decided not to build the retaining wall. Ms. Geise noted that it was not the HOA decision as it was the builder's decision. Ms. Todaro suggested that they had two developers and four builders and the developer of record assigned the building rights for that particular area to Gem Craft and at the time those buildings were being built, Gem Craft filed for Chapter 11 bankruptcy. She suggested that they just failed to build the retaining wall and did not know that it was part of the plan until the parking issue came up. She noted that the HOA has to work with the developers and when they walked back to the location looking at the plan they realized that there was supposed to be a retaining wall. She noted that she is not an engineer but in her opinion they don't want a retaining wall. She noted that it is very steep noting that she has one at her place and she thinks that they are very dangerous. She noted that she believes the slope bank is a much better way to go especially now that it is stabilized.

Ms. Lindsey noted that she had a concern as there are issues with units 187 and 188 with the soil. Ms. Todaro noted that it is the soil under the building. She noted if you look at Mr. Yingst's report he differentiates between the two and he will be doing the repairs once the permits are secured.

Mr. Seeds questioned who was to build the retaining wall. Ms. Todaro answered that she did not know noting that they had Gem Craft and Cornerstone and she did not know who was responsible. Mr. Seeds noted that it was part of the plan. Ms. Todaro noted that it was before her time.

Ms. Lindsey noted if you look at the report from the Township Engineer, Steve Fleming, he states that the retaining wall should not be eliminated.

Mr. Seeds noted if it is to be built who will pay for it. Ms. Todaro answered that she did not know as she could not find any money set aside for the retaining wall. Mr. Seeds questioned if there is an improvement guarantee for the plan. Mr. Wolfe answered yes but it is not enough to cover the existing improvements.

Mr. Seeds noted that it is a concern when the engineer says something different even though the crown vetch appears to make the area look stable but what if we get four days of heavy rain.

Ms. Todaro noted that we also have the other engineering report, but if you start messing with that soil she would be really concerned with what would happen. She noted that she has no idea why the engineer stated that it should be built. She noted that Yingst Engineer's who is doing the repairs does not believe one is necessary.

Mr. Seeds questioned if it is two different locations and two different walls. Ms. Todaro noted if you look the pictures that she submitted, on the last page, there is a little drawing for how the buildings look and they are basically a square box with four units. She noted that units 187 and 188 are the ones that face the bank for which you see how it slopes on the first two pages. She noted that units 186 and 189 face the road. She noted that the same is true for the next building over except there is a curve and they have a slope as well. She noted that she does not see that that slope is any different from the slope that had now been developed at 187 and 188. She noted that those slopes are all at about the same level and there is no retaining wall for any of those. She noted that she did not take pictures of those slopes but it is about the same. She explained that there may be some grass on those slopes versus crown vetch because that was what was planted to stabilize the area where the retaining wall was not installed. She noted that this was before her time.

Mr. Crissman noted that he has difficulty when the Board receives conflicting report from the Township Engineer who represents the Township. He questioned if there is any possibility... Mr. Wolfe noted that that the Township Engineer has not seen the Yingst report and he would recommend that Mr. Fleming review it. Mr. Crissman noted since that report is dated today he would prefer that Mr. Fleming review those documents. He noted where the proposed parking spaces are going in, has that been approved by the Township. Ms. Todaro answered that they have permits to do that. Mr. Crissman questioned if the residents are in agreement with the parking. Ms. Todaro answered yes as the voting included the parking addition.

Mr. Crissman noted that the question concerns the report received from Mr. Yingst and he would appreciate if Ms. Todaro would allow the Township Engineer to review that report. Ms. Todaro answered yes.

Mr. Seeds noted that staff and Mr. Wolfe should check on the improvement guarantees. Mr. Wolfe noted that the amount provided to him was \$55,000 that is outstanding. Mr. Seeds questioned if it included the retaining wall. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be for any of the remaining public improvements and he could check to see what it is for.

Mr. Seeds noted that he has no problem with the issues other than the retaining wall.

Mr. Crissman noted that staff will get back to Ms. Todaro after Mr. Fleming reviews the Yingst report.

Continues review of a proposed ordinance  
prohibiting the parking of vehicles on unpaved surfaces

Mr. Wolfe noted that this was discussed at a previous workshop session with the Board requesting additional information for this ordinance. He noted that the Board is proposing an amendment to the Property Maintenance Code to prohibit parking in the front yard of residential units.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the current change in language is a prohibition that no vehicle, regardless of its condition, shall be parked or stored in a front yard of any premises in an area zoned R-1, R-2, or RC as defined by Lower Paxton Township Zoning Ordinance. He noted that said prohibition shall not apply to parking on a driveway that exists in the front yard which has been established in accordance with the terms of said ordinance.

Mr. Wolfe noted from his notes from the last workshop session and discussions regarding the amendment, he felt that this draft is what the Board was looking for.

Mr. Hornung questioned what do you do if someone is having an event at the house and people park all over the front lawn. Mr. Wolfe noted that we discussed that last time but he did not have a solution for that.

Ms. Lindsey noted that she is looking for regulations for people who are constantly parking in their front yard. Mr. Hornung noted that he agrees with that issue but he can see the beginning of a neighborhood feud if someone does not like that a neighbor who is having a one-time party. He noted that they will call the police to require that all the party members move their

vehicles to where he did not know. Mr. Wolfe explained that it would not be enforced in that manner. He noted that the police would not enforce this as it would be enforced by a building codes officer as it would be a civil matter. He noted that this is not something where a tow truck would show up, as it would go before a magistrate as a civil proceeding.

Mr. Crissman noted that is his concern as well, as this is the perfect time of the year when graduation parties are occurring in people's homes and students come in and there may be a limited amount of parking available. Mr. Wolfe noted without establishing a temporary permit, he does not know how to allow that from going on. He noted that he was not looking to make this more complicated than it is. Mr. Crissman noted he is always concerned about enforcement and if you can't enforce it then you should not have it. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township does not work on an inspection basis, rather it is complaint driven; therefore staff will not drive around on a Saturday and look for events but if we know of a property owner who regularly parks his vehicle in his front yard in a R-1, R-2 or R-C area we can take the appropriate action. Mr. Crissman suggested that this is the spirit of this ordinance.

Mr. Seeds suggested that the language is too broad and he thinks it will be very difficult to enforce as it is written. He noted that if we wait until a complaint is received and then a citation is issued, they will complain about other cars that are doing the same thing. He noted that he does not want to approve this as it is written. Mr. Wolfe noted that he does not mind Mr. Seeds disapproval for the way the draft is written, but he would appreciate a suggestion as he is at a loss at this point.

Ms. Lindsey noted that what it states, is, what we are looking for in that the vehicles shall not be parked or stored in the front yard. She noted that we have residential areas, as she has it in her own neighborhood as well as Mr. Hawk, where they are constantly, day in and day out parking on the front yard. Mr. Seeds noted that is different and we need to write it in that regard. He noted that there could be an occasional party or some special event where that will occur. Mr. Hornung noted that most of those events will happen during the weekend at which point the Codes Enforcement Officer is not on duty, so the worse you would get is a police report. Mr. Wolfe noted that you could restrict the parking on Monday through Friday. Mr. Seeds questioned if we could put in language for an ongoing basis. Mr. Wolfe noted that you have to define it. Mr. Hornung noted that we discussed that the last time and it would not be enforceable so that language will not work. He noted if you did Monday through Friday that might be better. Mr.

Crissman agreed. Mr. Stine noted that he is not exactly sure what the goal is. He questioned if it is to prohibit someone from parking in their yard on a daily basis. Ms. Lindsey answered yes so they don't use it as a parking lot or the driveway. Mr. Stine questioned if you wanted to include anything other than motor vehicles like boats on trailers. Mr. Crissman questioned if the word vehicle would be all inclusive. Mr. Stine noted that they could have snowmobiles and trailers, a jet ski on a trailer or just a trailer. Mrs. Lindsey questioned if you would have to say vehicles plus trailers. Mr. Hornung noted that Recreational Vehicles (RV) have been parked on the front lawn. Ms. Lindsey questioned if a RV would be covered by vehicles. Mr. Stine questioned if we have an ordinance of the parking of RV in the street. Mr. Wolfe answered that we have an ordinance that prohibits the parking of tractors and or trailers in a residential zones on the street. Mr. Stine questioned if it also prohibit boats on trailers. Mr. Wolfe noted that any trailer that is unhooked. Mr. Stine noted that you could look at that and use similar language to include just a motor vehicle. Mr. Wolfe noted that is what we did here except we extended it into the yard.

Mr. Hornung questioned if we get many complaints about boats or other things like that. Mr. Wolfe noted that we don't get many complaints, but it does occur. He noted that we get all sorts of parking complaints to include school bus parking in residential areas and motor homes and boats parking in the front yard.

Mr. Hornung questioned why only the front yard because he has had complaints about people who store their vehicles for multiple years in the back yard. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would have to be addressed to the Board. Mr. Seeds noted that there is a lot of that all over the Township.

Mr. Hornung noted that there is an ordinance for if you park your car in the backyard it and it doesn't have a current registration or inspection that staff can force it to be brought up to date or removed. Mr. Wolfe answered that unlicensed and unregistered vehicles can be removed. Mr. Hornung noted that it would take care of those complaints.

Mr. Hornung noted that we could always modify this as we move forward but at this point he does not find anything objectionable about initiating it. He noted that it is not irrevocable. He noted that Judges Lindsey and Wenner are both common sense in their approach that if it doesn't make sense, they throw it out. He noted that it is a measure that would stop any irrational enforcement, for if it fits the letter of the law it makes sense. He noted that the two judges seem to be able to navigate their ways through those situations well. He noted that he

feels comfortable with the two judges having the final say in making sense if it is someone with a grudge or someone acting improperly who continues to park in their front lawn.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if an offender received a letter providing ten days to remove the vehicle. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is a civil matter that starts out with a friendly letter notifying them of the ordinance followed by a request to correct the matter. He noted after a time period that can be anywhere from three to ten days, they will do an inspection and if the vehicle has not been removed, then staff will issue a citation and take it before the magistrate. He noted that the entire process can easily take 45 days.

Mr. Seeds noted if someone parked on the lawn on a Sunday and it was not there on a Monday, there would be no violation. Mr. Wolfe noted that the goal is for the violation to be corrected. Mr. Crissman suggested that it would take care of the graduation party incidents.

Mr. Crissman suggested that the wording, “regardless of condition” be removed from in the ordinance, noting that it should state no vehicle shall be parked or stored. He noted that the condition of the automobile is not under consideration.

Mr. Seeds questioned why R-3 zoning is not included in the revision. Mr. Wolfe answered that R-3 would have a front yard but they would also have parking in the front yards as a form of a parking lot noting that it is basically zoning for apartment buildings that are laid out differently. He noted that most R-3 developments are managed properties and not single-family lots.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he did not include a Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) as they contain strange features that are particular to the development and come with a volume of conveyances. He noted that he restricted it to R-1, R-2 and RC zoning.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he will clean up the wording and advertise it for a public hearing to be held in about 30 days at which time the Board may choose to adopt it.

Review of a proposed resolution amending the  
Stormwater Management Permit requirements

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township has implemented a stormwater management permit process based upon new stormwater management regulations and what triggers this is new impervious area. He noted that staff has encountered requests for zoning permit that propose a diminimus amount of impervious area but by the technical provisions of the ordinance require stormwater management. He noted as an example, if some is installing an air conditioner and

needs a three foot by three foot pad; it requires a stormwater management permit. He noted by the technical definitions of the permit a fence requires a permit however it has no new impervious cover. He noted that a Rubbermaid storage facility, child's plastic pools or playhouses, all of which are typically 50 square feet or less but by the terms of the ordinance are new impervious area.

Mr. Wolfe noted that staff has put together a resolution to amend the existing stormwater management process to exclude a permit being required for any new additional impervious area of 50 square feet or less. He noted if this is acceptable it could be added to a business meeting agenda for consideration.

Mr. Seeds suggested that it was necessary for people putting in a swimming pool over 1,000 square feet. Mr. Wolfe noted that is the stormwater management regulations and it has different thresholds that require specific actions. He noted that this is for when a permit would be required. He noted that any new impervious area has to comply with stormwater management regulations but staff does not think that it is fair for people to have to get a permit when they are only adding 50 square feet or less.

Mr. Seeds questioned if we could make it a little bigger, such as a 8 foot by ten foot or ten foot by ten foot shed. Mr. Wolfe suggested that a ten foot by ten foot shed would be getting pretty big noting that you could have a patio that is ten by ten. Mr. Wolfe noted that the threshold would be subjective and staff discussed where the plastic sheds stop and the stick build sheds start and it is roughly in the eight by ten square foot area. He noted that he would not go any bigger than eight by ten. He noted that staff stopped at five foot by ten foot or 50 square feet. Mr. Hornung questioned what the danger of going larger than that is. Mr. Wolfe answered that you would have more pervious structures. Mr. Hornung questioned if there is an ordinance to cover if someone wants to put a shed in their yard. Mr. Wolfe noted that sheds are exempt from building codes but they have to get a zoning permit. Mr. Hornung questioned if they only need a zoning permit. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mrs. Lindsey questioned if it was for any size shed. Mr. Wolfe answered that it is for any size shed less than 1,000 square feet.

Mr. Hornung questioned what would be the advantage of requiring a permit for a shed for stormwater. Mr. Wolfe explained that the Township has a Stormwater management ordinance that regulates how new impervious areas have to be regulated. He noted up to 1,000 square feet you need a Stormwater Management Plan. He noted that we need to have a review of those

facilities. He noted that is done through the permit process, but what he is saying that there are diminimus amounts of impervious area that we don't want to be looking at and people should not have to pay a permit for. He questioned what that diminimus amount is. He noted when you are over 100 square feet you are outside of that range.

Mr. Hornung questioned what the downside is if we don't do it and we say 100 square feet. Mr. Wolfe noted that you could be viewed as not managing your Stormwater management regulations properly and be subject to Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) review of the process. Mr. Hornung questioned what would happen if they found that we were not doing Stormwater management properly. Mr. Wolfe suggested that Mr. Stine could answer that. Mr. Stine answered that it would be a violation. Mr. Hornung questioned if they would fine the Township or provide notice. Mr. Stine answered that the fine would be substantial, and could be in excess of \$100,000. He noted that they fined Swatara Township substantially for a MS4 violation not too long ago. He noted that that it would not be the same but the Township could be subject to fines.

Mr. Crissman noted that we need to reach a consensus for a resolution. Mr. Seeds noted that it says 50 square feet or less. Mr. Crissman noted that it states the addition of a new impervious area on lot where said area is 50 square feet. Mr. Wolfe noted that it should state up to 50 square feet. Mr. Hornung suggested that it should be 80 square feet. Mr. Wolfe noted that staff talked about 80 feet and he could live with 80 feet. Mr. Hornung noted that he would go for 80 square feet. Ms. Lindsey noted that if you don't go higher than 80 square feet she would agree to that. Mr. Crissman noted that it should read not to exceed 80 square feet. Mr. Crissman requested Mr. Wolfe to rewrite the amendment with a not-to-exceed of 80 square feet.

Status report regarding the Colonial Park  
Rotary Linglestown Clock Project

Mr. Wolfe displayed pictures of the proposed clock. He noted that the Colonial Park Rotary is working in conjunction with the Village of Linglestown and its 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Committee to fund raise and develop a Linglestown Rotary Clock. He noted that the Committee will help to raise funds with the Rotary for the project, such as selling commemorative pavers at the base of the clock as part of the major fund raising effort as well as plaques at the base of the clock. He noted that they will also look for additional fund raising in the form of grants from

foundations with a goal of securing total project funding of \$150,000. He noted that the clock and its landscaping and surrounding pavers should not exceed \$30,000 but the Clock committee is also looking for a \$20,000 minimum amount to place in escrow for ongoing maintenance of the clock.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the clock will be located in the PennDOT/Township right-of-way, on North West corner of the Linglestown Square. He noted that it would be in front of the Linglestown restaurant, and would be a standard Rotary issue clock, noting that the closest one in the area is located in Hummelstown. Mr. Seeds noted that it is in front of the Sr. Thomas Restaurant. Mr. Wolfe noted that it will be a four-faced or two-faced clock depending on the amount of funds raised.

Mr. Wolfe displayed a landscape view of the clock and surroundings. He noted that the architectural views have been prepared by students of the Dauphin County Technical School who should be commended in their design work for the facility. He noted that HRG, the Township's Engineer has agreed to donate its engineering services to the Clock Committee and the Rotary in the development of the clock itself. He noted that the Board should be aware that the Rotary is proposing a three-part agreement between the Linglestown Civic Association and the Township. He noted that the Rotary is listed twice in the agreement, not only the Rotary Club of Colonial Park but also the Rotary foundation. He noted that the Township is envisioned as being the ultimate entity that will provide for maintenance for the clock through the escrow funds that are raised by these groups in the development of the clock project.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Crissman and Mr. Hawk both have been actively involved in this project in their capacity as Rotary members. Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Wolfe explained the project very well and is also a member of the Colonial Park Rotary.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if they raise the \$30,000 for the clock but not the additional \$20,000 for maintenance, would the Township be responsible for the maintenance. Mr. Wolfe answered that there is no expectation on the Clock Committee's part that the Township would be financially responsible for anything. He noted that their goal is to raise \$150,000 with funds in excess of the roughly \$50,000 necessary for the clock and its escrow account to go to the Linglestown 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Celebration. He noted that there is a lot of momentum in Linglestown to raise far more than necessary for this project because the Linglestown

organizations then become beneficiaries of not only the clock but funds for the 250<sup>th</sup> Anniversary celebration. He noted that Mr. Seeds is a member of that Committee.

Mr. Seeds noted that he is expecting that the goal will be met.

Mr. Crissman noted that he and Mr. Wolfe had questioned the Committees about what would happen if there were not enough funds to purchase the clock. He noted that they discussed the difference in cost between a four-sided or three-sided clock. He noted that there are back up plans in the event that the total amount of dollars is not realized.

Mr. Wolfe noted that no agreement has been signed at this time but he wanted to make the Board aware that it will be coming to the Board in the not-too-distance future.

#### Presentation of the 2013 Annual Report – Executive Summary

Mr. Wolfe noted that the annual report is a requirement of the Township Manager in accordance with the codified ordinances of Lower Paxton Township. He noted that the Executive Summary (ES) for 2013 provides a brief description of the Township's financial and administrative activities for the last fiscal year. He noted that each Department Director spends a great deal of time preparing their reports and providing the necessary historical information and perspectives as we look at the past in order to know where we are going in the future.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the full annual report to include the ES and department reports are available on the resource page for the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Lower Paxton Township is the second largest municipality by population in Dauphin County and the 17<sup>th</sup> largest municipality in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania with 47,360 residents within 28 square miles. He noted that 17<sup>th</sup> largest may not sound like a huge number but you have to take in perspective that there are over 2,600 municipalities in the State.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the operating budgets including capital budgets and fiduciary funds totaling over \$83 million in the 2013 fiscal year. He noted that the Township is not a small operation with a work force consisting of 136 full- time employees and nearly 400 part-time and seasonal workers. He noted that it has 203 miles of local roads, 270 miles of sanitary sewers, 378 acres of parkland and the ancillary facilities associated with these public facilities. He noted that it includes the municipal center, public works and sanitary sewer buildings and the Friendship Center.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board of Supervisors is the executive body of the Township and it operates in accordance with recommendations from various advisory bodies that include: Authority Board, Audit Committee, Planning Commission, Parks and Recreation Board, Zoning Hearing Board, Shade Tree Commission, Public Safety Committee, Arts Council, Greenway Committee, Community Engagement Committee, Koon/Wolfersberger Park Planning Committee, and the Friendship Center Operating Board.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township operates under the Second Class Township Code and under that form of government the Board of Supervisors is both legislative and administrative. He noted that the Board makes the laws that run the Township and acts as the governor, the chief executive authority for the day-to-day administrative activities. He noted the Board has developed a vision that: “The Township will be an open, vibrant, and progressive municipality working within the bounds of available resources, providing the best quality of life for a growing community and to be a recognized leader in central Pennsylvania.”

Mr. Wolfe noted that the major municipal facilities include the Municipal Center which is a 52,000 square foot facility that was occupied in 2004, housing the Police Department on the ground level and the Community Development, Finance Department, Sewer Authority and Administrative offices on the top floor. He noted that the Township indoor recreation center, the Friendship Center (FC) for the community and neighboring communities is a 62,000 square foot building that was built in 2000 and is now subject of considerable discussion in regard to its financial operations and mission. He noted that the FC does not make and has not made its financial goals as originally established by the Board and it has been working to address that financial concern by making improvements to the building and making adjustments to its mode of operation.

Mr. Wolfe noted that other significant facilities include the Public Works Building which is a 25,000 square foot facility built in the late 1980’s that is proposed to be renovated or added on to, which will be funded by the Board through a 2014 General Obligation Bond.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Sewer Operations Building was completed in 2002 and is a 12,000 square foot facility located in the same complex area as the Public Works building. He noted that the Compost Facility is located on a closed municipal landfill made up of 60 acres providing for the processing of leaf waste for the community and West Hanover Township. He noted that it is maintained in accordance with a consent order from DEP.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the municipal parks have nearly 400 acres of parkland, 18 public parks and four regional parks which include George, Koons, Kohl/Lingle and Brightbill.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board of Supervisors employees 136 full-time employees, a very low number of full-time employees for the community, having a high number of 152 in 2007 but due to the great recession of 2008 through 2013, staff was reduce mostly by attrition to address the financial constraints.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board completed the 2006 strategic plan in 2012; a plan of operation for capital facilities over a five year period, and the Board has begun the development of a Phase Two strategic plan.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township is a union shop having three AFSCME collective bargaining units with agreements extending through 2016 and a police employees' unit with an agreement that extends to the end of 2014.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Lower Paxton Township is a member of the Pennsylvania Intermunicipal Health Insurance Cooperative (PIMHIC) for employee health care benefits. He noted that the Cooperative has 210 municipal members and over 7,100 employees are covered by this group. He noted that he is the Vice-President of the group and has been a member of the cooperative since 2003 when they formed the Capital Region Insurance Trust. He noted that it merged four years ago with several other municipal cooperatives in central and eastern Pennsylvania to form PIMHIC and it has been very successful in controlling health care rates for local government members. He noted in 2013 the Cooperative provided the Township with a \$255,195 return from 2012 payments for services. He noted that the Township pays an actuarially determined amount for health care benefits on an annual basis that is about \$1.2 million and if the Township does not use it all, it will return the remaining funds. He noted in 2012, based upon the 2011 use, the Township got back over \$400,000 and in one year the Township received back over \$500,000. He noted the beauty of being in a self-insured cooperative is if you don't use the money you get it back.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township is in a similar relationship for unemployment benefits as the Township belongs to the Susquehanna Municipal Trust (SMT). He noted that SMT has 55 members and it is a self-insured trust for workers compensation. He noted that he also sits on the Board of Trustees for that organization as well. He explained that it has helped to maintain the costs for Worker Compensation and has allowed the Township to provide a safe workplace and

low insurance module for the workers in the Township. He noted that the Township has one of the lowest insurance modes in the group.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Lower Paxton Township was named a Tree City USA by the National Arbor Day Foundation as a result of the active work of the Township's Shade Tree Commission.

Mr. Wolfe noted at the end of last year, the Township came to the complete conclusion of the Paxton Creek Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) battle with DEP and EPA whereby the TMDL was essentially suspended for Paxton Creek and the nitrogen and phosphorus limits were not placed upon that drainage basin.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Finance Department maintained a rate of taxation of 1.300 mills, the lowest of any of the developed municipalities in Dauphin County. He noted that he will not review the financial figures for 2013 but in both 2012 and 2013 fiscal years. He noted that the Township now has a fund balance for operations that exceeds the 25% threshold of expenditures in anyone fiscal year.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board has multiple operating funds that provide services in Lower Paxton Township over and above the General Fund, the State Aid Fund that provides for maintenance of roadway, General Improvement Fund which covers capital facilities for municipal operations; Fire Equipment Capital Fund which is used to purchase primary firefighting apparatus for the three fire companies; Length of Service Awards Program for volunteer fire fighters and fire police officers; and the Lower Paxton Township Authority which is a large operation, an enterprise fund providing sanitary sewer service much like a utility that operates on an annual budget in excess of \$13 million and has capital projects on an ongoing basis that vary from \$10 to \$15 million. He noted that there are two pension funds, with the police pension fund having a balance of \$20 million and the non-uniform employee pension fund possessing a balance of \$13 million.

Mr. Seeds noted under the Community Development section it states that the Recreation Plan was adopted in 2013. He questioned what that was referring to. Mr. Wolfe answered that is the plan for park development in the Township that was developed and adopted for the Board to levy the SALDO fee-in-lieu amount.

Mr. Wolfe noted that new housing starts in 2013 were 78, an indicator of economic activity in the Township. He noted that it nearly double from what it was with 48 in 2012, 40 in

2011, 54 in 2010, and 51 in 2009. He noted that it has not come close to the average number of housing starts the Township used to have in the community prior to 2007, where there were roughly 182 new single-family housing starts. He noted that we have experienced improvement in the economy, reestablishment of a sound fund balance in the General Fund, but we have not returned to standard operating procedures by economic standards for pre-recession times.

Mr. Wolfe noted in 2013, the Board reenacted the storm water management regulations for the fourth or fifth time in the last three or four years. He noted that the Community Development Department enforces the Uniform Construction Code and provides support to the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, Zoning Hearing Board, and the Public Safety Committee. He noted that the Board is a member of the Capital Region Council of Governments and participates in the Council of Governments Uniform Construction Code Appeals Board.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Health Department provides residential waste collection services to approximately 14,000 residential customers through a contract with Waste Management. He noted in 2012, the Board extended the contract for services for an additional five-year period from July 2013 through June 2018. He noted for the first two years of the extension, there was no increase in cost with a 2.2% increase in the years thereafter.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Health Department also oversees the contract with Penn Waste for the sale of recyclables noting that all recyclables placed at curbside in the Township have been sold under a competitive bid process to Penn Waste who markets them and provides the Township with a share of their marketing revenues. He noted that Lower Paxton Township is one of a handful who has sold their recyclables to a recycling facility in the state. He noted that revenues in this line item should exceed \$100,000 in most fiscal years.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Health Department manages the sale of Compost Permits for individuals who want to gain access to the Compost Facility and use it for the deposit of leaf waste and for taking processed materials back to their residences. He noted that they also maintain the closed municipal landfill and works to provide for Property Maintenance procedures with 392 property maintenance complaints addressed last year with 210 violations notices sent to property owners.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Parks and Recreation Department has nearly 400 acres of municipal parkland and 18 developed municipal parks. He noted that we have a municipal indoor

recreation center at the FC and these two operations jointly employ 11 full-time employees and more than 450 part-time and seasonal employees.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Parks and Recreation Department including the FC offered over 800 programs, activities and events last year serving nearly 16,000 participants and managed the activities of 27 sports organizations with over 5,000 participants. He noted in 2013 the Township secured the Wolfersberger Tract and completed the Wolfersberger/Koons Park Plan Project.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township has lease agreements with the Central Dauphin School District for fields in George Park in conjunction with the Paxtonia Elementary School and also use of the football field behind the Central Dauphin East Middle School.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Greenway Committee is active in the development of pedestrian paths to include the adoption of a Greenway Plan with the Committee actively engaged with a Greenway Plan Project.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Parks and Recreation staff provide liaison assistance to the Parks and Recreation Board, Friendship Center Operating Board, Greenway Committee, Community Engagement Committee, Koon/Wolfersberger Park Planning Committee, and the Arts Council.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Friendship Center building had a market analysis completed to discuss certain changes in the building for market potential and staff is working to address the recommendations from the Ballard King Report. He noted that the presentation provided earlier by Mr. Luetchford in regard to the FC survey for potential changes to operations or expansions of the facility and the brief commercial provided by the FC member shows the efforts of the FCOB and staff in regards to the implementation of the various efforts that have begun in 2013.

Mr. Wolfe noted in 2013, the Board issued debt in the amount of 2013 in General Obligation bonds and part of that was pledged to the FC. He noted that staff is currently under contract to replace the HVAC units in the FC natatorium that will be completed in 2014 and 2015.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the FCOB and the Board of Supervisors have prepared a capital replacement plan for the FC that spans a 20 year time period providing an annual replacement cost for this facility of approximately \$170,000.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Police Department had 53 sworn officers in 2013, down from a high of 64 officers in 2008. He noted those officers responded to 24,000 calls for services, and investigated over 1,108 Part I crimes with a clearance rate of 42%. He noted there were 1,416 Part II crimes having a clearance rate of 63%. He noted that the police investigated 360 reportable traffic accidents and issued 5,367 traffic citations and 14,821 written warnings.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Department has established and maintained a Citizens Police Academy, Rapid Response Team, School Recourse Officer Program, Community Service Officer Detail, Warrant Officer, Fire Marshall, Honor Guard, and members of the Police Department serve on the Dauphin County Drug Task Force and Crisis Response Team. He noted that the Department houses an office for the Dauphin County Victim/Witness Program.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the three fire companies responded to a total of 824 incidents and the Township receives emergency medical services from SCEMS, operating in accordance with an agreement with the Board of Supervisors that it executed in 2012. He noted that Colonial Park, Linglestown and Paxtonia Fire Companies serve the citizens of the Township. He noted that the Board provides primary firefighting apparatus to those three fire companies.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Public Works Department in 2013 had 30 full-time employees that maintained over 200 miles of road, 105 miles of developed parkland, 150 miles of stormsewer, 39 signalized intersections, 4,500 street signs, seven bridges, and over 100 vehicles for all Township Departments. He noted that it operates out of the Jack F. Hurley Transportation and Maintenance Center on Locust Lane. He noted that the 2013/2014 winter was a memorable one and the financial statistics will show that later when he reviews the Key indicator Report.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Public Works Department is working actively to address the deficiencies in the storm sewer system in accordance with the Township's MS4 Program and the Township's NPDES Permit with DEP and EPA. He noted in 2013, over \$ 1million was spent for stormwater improvements and the Board has borrowed in 2012, 2013, and 2014 for ongoing stormwater projects. He noted that the plan provides for the expenditure of approximately \$1.2 million on an annual basis for the next five years for stormwater improvements.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Public Works Department is under contract with PennDOT for maintenance of 18 miles of state roadways. He noted that they maintain the Compost Facility and provide for the processing of leaf waste. He noted last year in conjunction with the Sanitary Sewer Department I&I program they paved over 4.65 miles. He noted that the 39 traffic signals

include one new one, the signal at Page Road and Crusader Way. He noted that the traffic signals are all LED lights and most operate in a closed loop interconnected system.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the sanitary sewer Department maintains 270 miles of sanitary sewer lines with six pump stations and a package treatment plant. He noted that they have 22 full-time employees and several part-time employees including a four person I&I crew. He noted that they are actively involved with replacing sanitary sewer lines in accordance with the consent order agreement with the DEP. He explained, by that consent order, the Township is replacing a significant portion of its sanitary sewer system in Paxton Creek estimated at \$75 million over 15 years. He noted that there is an equal amount of work to be done in Beaver Creek over a 15-year period.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the program in the next 15 years will have spent nearly \$100 million to upgrade sanitary sewers for the community. He noted that the rates for operation were set last year charging a rental rate of \$120 per quarter and that rate was increased in 2014 to \$125 per quarter. He provided a list of the maintenance projects and the I&I projects that are under management by Authority staff.

Mr. Wolfe noted that completes his Executive Summary for municipal operations in 2013 fiscal year.

Mr. Crissman noted that it shows that we are a very comprehensive municipality and it demonstrates the efficiency of the staff that makes it happen.

#### Review of the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter 2014 Key Indicator Report

Mr. Crissman noted that this report is not available tonight and will be provided next week during the business meeting. Mr. Wolfe noted that he has a abridged version for this meeting but if the Board does not mind he can do it as part of the televised business meeting next week.

#### Improvement Guarantee

Mr. Crissman noted that there was one improvement guarantee to approve.

#### Rite Aid Corporation

An increase in a bond with Westchester Fire Insurance Company in the amount of \$392,136.25 with an expiration date of November 19, 2104.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to accept the one improvement guarantee. Mrs. Lindsey seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

Adjournment

Mr. Seeds made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Hornung seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle  
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

William L. Hornung  
Township Secretary