

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop Meeting held September 9, 2014

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., Gary A. Crissman, and Robin Lindsey.

Also in attendance was George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steven Stine, Township Solicitor; Brian Luetchford, Parks and Recreation Director; Sam Robbins, Public Works Director; Steve Fleming HRG, Inc.; Jim Weaver, Paxton Athletic Association; David Blain Capital Area Soccer Association (CASA); Daniel Summey, Sean Reed, Greg Smith, and John Reed, Linglestown Paintball; Tim Mellott, Mellott Engineering, Gary Gardner, Devonshire Memorial United Brethren in Christ Church; Joel McNaughton, McNaughton Company; Jeff Staub, Dauphin Engineering Co., and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Public Comment

No public comment was provided.

Request from Paxton Athletic Association, Linglestown Baseball Association, and CASA regarding the Hurley Fields at the Public Works site

Mr. Hawk explained that the Board members received a memo from the Paxton Athletic Association, Linglestown Baseball and Capital Area Soccer Association (CASA). He noted that the general desire is to keep Hurley Fields in the same proximity, in the same place that it is currently located at.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Jim Weaver, Commissioner of the Paxton Athletic Baseball Association will start the presentation to the Board members this evening.

Mr. Jim Weaver thanked the Board members for allowing him to discuss this with the Board members tonight. He noted that he is the baseball Commissioner of the Paxton Athletic Association, having been in that position for about three years. He explained that he has been involved with many issues involving fields, and noted that the Hurley Field has been around for many years. He explained that it is an intermediate field that the 13 year olds play on which is simply a transitional field from a midget field to a full size field. He noted that it is the only intermediate field in Lower Paxton Township and both Linglestown and Paxton Athletic Association share its use throughout the year for spring and fall baseball. He explained that two teams use the field.

Mr. Weaver stated that the organization has a strong desire to keep it where it is at this time. He noted that they would like to keep it at the same location in exactly the same spot. He noted that it is a permanent baseball field and only used for baseball purposes. He noted that it is not shared with soccer or any other sport. He noted that the field is used every night during the week for practices and for games on weekend. He explained that it is occupied six months out of the year if not seven depending on when the seasons start.

Mr. Weaver noted that he started to talk about a year ago about how we were going to team up with CASA to try to solidified the opportunity to have fields for the long term. He noted that it did not involve Hurley Field at that time, but it did involve an agreement that CASA would help Paxton Athletic Association financially in solidifying the relationship for the JV field at Central Dauphin East (CDE) Junior High School. He explained that we have used the JV field for many years since the housing development in that area was completed. He noted years ago when he played on the baseball field, it was right outside the football field. He noted that has been eliminated and we don't have the ability to do that, but we have the availability of the varsity and JV field at CDE High School complex. He noted part of the financial arrangement that CASA had was the installation of a new fence and they have made some improvements that we were going to help with at the high school.

Mr. Weaver requested Mr. Blain to talk to this matter. He noted that he would really like the Hurley Field to stay where it is because it is centralized with the area kids that we serve as we have kids that live in Penbrook that come to our area. He noted that the field location is ideal as we serve Penbrook and West Hanover Township.

Mr. David Blain, 1197 Knacklyn Farm Court, explained that he is the vice-president of CASA. He noted that Eric Beittel the President of CASA is present as well. He noted that we have been in discussion with Paxton Athletic Association (PAA) for a year in regards to their George Park field that has the backstop. He noted that the field is not finished. He noted that CASA would like to get one more official 11 field. He noted that having it on that upper tier of that park would be perfect. He noted that we asked PAA what we can do to work with them and he and Mr. Weaver discussed that they don't need the field at George Park. He noted what they need is to upgrade the fields that they have at the CDE High School complex. He noted that they discussed the idea of CASA helping to upgrade the field at the CDE High Complex, supplying a new fence or batting cage. He noted in turn they would work with us to give us access to using the baseball field at George Park full time. He noted that they worked with the Central Dauphin School District, met with personnel at East High, and worked out an arrangement in regards to helping Paxton AA install a fence at the CDE JV field. He noted that is the baseball field that is between the Middle School and the High School.

Mr. Blain noted we had that worked out and when we heard about the Hurley Field situation with the expansion to the Public Works building and that it could be eliminated and possibly moved to George Park that is when we felt that we needed to meet with the Board of Supervisors. He noted the Babe Ruth field is the only field in Lower Paxton Township at that size. He noted that it fits perfectly for Paxton and Linglestown baseball. He explained, although he sits on the Board of CASA he is also the incoming baseball coach for Paxton and his son will be playing for them. He noted that he understands both sides of the equation and having been a former Board of Supervisor, knowing what you will be going through with the expansion and trying to save fields, we thought that this would be a plan to work across the board.

Mr. Blain noted that he and Mr. Weaver have been out to the Hurley Field trying to figure out how that can be rearranged and moved around. He noted with a little bit of earth

moving, the field could be kept, maybe moving it more towards the front of the facility depending on what you decide to do with the renovations. He noted that the organizations would like to maintain baseball fields and also allow CASA the ability for one last field which is what we need in the George Park complex. He noted that it would be considered a very high class soccer facility in Pennsylvania, and explained that they sponsored a classic tournament in August and you would be surprised at how many teams came from out of the area, from New York and New Jersey. He noted that those teams would die to have the ability to have these kinds of soccer fields in their areas. He noted that we have worked out an arrangement that will work for everyone but it would be dependent on what happens at the Public Works building. He noted that he would address any questions.

Mr. Weaver noted that this was the lead in when Mr. Blain approached him about some financial assistance. He noted that he had an experience in the past 12 months with the school district that you have to apply for usage of the fields. He noted that you are not guaranteed usage of the those fields and he ran into a situation with the basketball association where it was kicked out of the Junior High School that it had been using for 25 years. He noted that part of the negotiating that we have with the Central Dauphin East High with Ford Thompson is if we financially assist or improve the field we would like some type of agreement that we would be guaranteed fields for an x amount of years. He explained that has not been agreed upon but that is the leverage that we will look to have to help protect us. He noted for full size baseball fields there are two in the Township that we can use. He noted that they are both at the CDE High School facility.

Mr. Hawk noted that the presentation was well done, very clear and it provided some understandability. He stated that you are not objecting to moving Hurley Field as long as it stays in the same location. Mr. Weaver noted the only concern that he had and he walked the field today was the right field length where we would put the fence. He noted perception wise, it looks like it is perfectly straight and the same size that the current field is but there is a little shortage problem if we move it up closer to Locust Lane. He stated that we can eliminate that by not putting a four foot fence in but a 12 or 18 foot fence in right field which will make the distance a little longer. He noted that the one thing that he can tell the Board is that the field that is setting

there now if one of the nicest 13 year-old fields we play on. He noted that it is well kept, well maintained and the kids at that age are excited when they see a fence out there. He noted that there are no other fields that we play at where there is a fence that someone can hit a home run. He noted that home runs do occur. He noted that putting a similar type field where there is a permanent fence makes it enjoyable for the kids to play there.

Mr. Hawk noted, if the Board goes ahead with the plan for the Public Works building and that field, it would be ridiculous if we don't sit down and make sure we are all in agreement with the who, what's, and how.

Mr. Hawk questioned if you have to get permission to make any modification to the fields at CDE Junior High School. Mr. Weaver answered that the Paxton AA went as far as the School District getting estimates for the improvement that we are looking to do. He noted that we were ready to roll with this on the School District side, noting that Ford Thompson told them to do whatever they need to do to get it done, as he would like to have something like that done. He noted that they met with the facility maintenance person and the staff person who does all the scheduling with the fields. He noted that they have the CDE estimate and know what it will cost as we were planning on having the fence installed at the end of July so it would be in place for fall baseball season but that is ... Mr. Hawk noted the reason for his asking the question if that assuming we don't make any decision, but if we move ahead with what we want to do to make sure that it does not become a stumbling block. Mr. Weaver noted that he had received the School District's word that everything is still a go. He noted that we put it on hold until we discuss this with the School Board members because of this issue.

Mr. Hawk noted that you would give up the one field in George Park which would be used for CASA. Mr. Blain noted that Parks and Recreation Department would have to give CASA the rights to use the field. He noted that in the spirit of good will we have worked out an arrangement that works for all providing a dedicated field for CASA to use noting that it has a history of improving fields and putting money into fields. He noted that the goal of CASA would be to do the same at the upper tier field what was done to the other two fields in George Park where we brought Hummer Turf Improvements in, noting that they do the work at Beaver Stadium. He noted that we would do the same thing to make improvements to the turf in the

upper field providing three fields that would have high level quality turf. He noted that it would be dependent upon the Parks and Recreation Board and the Board of Supervisors approving CASA's use of that field spring and fall. He noted that no baseball is played on that field, and that would be contingent upon making it happen. He suggested that we can save Hurley Field, CASA can help Paxton AA with some other field, and he is hoping that CASA can improve the other field in George Park and all parties will meet their goals and objectives.

Mr. Hawk noted that he would not want to speak for the rest of the Board but he thinks that they have provided a reasonable solution to what could be a difficult problem and that is what it is all about. He noted that he likes the suggestion.

Ms. Lindsey noted that when we talked about the expansion, we did talk about the baseball fields. She noted that the Board did consider the baseball fields and if you don't have any problems with moving it she didn't think the Board did either.

Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Blain should be aware of what is happening at that location, because of additional construction needs, all needs have to be taken into consideration and planned for. Mr. Blain noted that is why we are here today. Mr. Crissman noted that we can incorporate this into our planning in the future. He noted that even though CASA has the use of the fields they are not exclusively owned and operated and guaranteed to CASA because it is district wide. He noted that the land is owned by everyone. Mr. Blain answered that he understood that.

Mr. Wolfe noted that we will need to retain a landscape architect to look at the site and probably map things out so you know what you can and cannot do. Mr. Crissman noted that there is another piece that we can't discuss at this time so that will also come into play as well.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Weaver will have to get permission from the School District to make the improvements and he is on his way to do that, but he questioned if you don't see a problem with that. Mr. Weaver answered no. Mr. Seeds noted that Penn Garden uses the midget field, and questioned if they are aware of this. Mr. Weaver answered not that he is aware of. Mr. Seeds noted that they could lose that field, whether they need it or not, and it is up in the air if the Mateer Field could be used. Mr. Blain noted having spent the last few years coaching baseball

for Lower Paxton/West Hanover Townships, the Mateer Field is a nice baseball field and it is to assume that Colonial Park is no longer around to play on the field but it would be an idea site to move the current Penn Garden facility to that facility as it has dugouts, a concession stand, and a nice fence the whole way around it with ample parking being easy to get to. He noted that it would be a good place to put their minor baseball program and the working baseball program that is for eight or nine years old with the minors being for ten years old.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the Colonial Park Baseball Association is out of business. Mr. Blain answered that those children had the ability to play for Pleasant Hills Ridgeview (PHR) which is out of Brightbill Park or Penn Gardens. He noted for the past couple of years Penn Garden has merged their kids into Swatara's program. He noted in the past two years they haven't had a major team of 11 to 12-year olds. He noted that we had some minor working teams but their numbers are not very strong. He explained that having another field for Penn Gardens to use wouldn't be a bad situation but he is not sure how much they would use it.

Mr. Seeds questioned how much the upper midget field is used. Mr. Blain noted in the spring time they have a T-ball program and Pony program for seven and eight year olds but these are not kids who are up there practicing. He noted that having them move to Mateer Field; noting from where the Penn Gardens field is, it is not much of a distance from driving down from the Hurley Fields.

Mr. Seeds noted that someone should be talking to Penn Gardens and or PHR. Mr. Blain noted that PHR would not be a factor in this as they have their own fields in Brightbill Park. He noted that there should be a discussion with Penn Gardens Baseball about this. Mr. Seeds noted that the Parks and Recreation Department needs to be talking to them about this. He noted that he has a concern about a loss of field and we should be talking to them now. He noted that we need to look at Mateer Field to see what the situation is there. He suggested that Mr. Luetchford would be talking about this. He noted that he has no concern for what Mr. Blain is suggesting but he is concerned about the loss of the midget field and knowing that everyone else is comfortable with the arrangements. He noted that his concern is if CASA does take over the field at George Park the backstop that was built cost a lot of money and he questioned if it could be moved to

another location, wherever it would be needed. He noted that we need to talk to Penn Gardens and PHR about the use of the midget field at Hurley Field and the use of the backstop.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mateer Field is not being used now. Mr. Blain noted that it is being used for a kickball league.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Luetchford had any information on Mateer Field or moving the backstop until it was needed. Mr. Luetchford answered that he has a meeting scheduled concerning the Mateer Field organization in early October. He noted that the Colonial Park Baseball is represented by one person and is interested in no longer retaining the area for baseball. He noted, according to the bylaws, the neighbors have ownership for that property and he will meet with them on Monday, October 6th to explain to them what the property entails and that they have rights to the property, but they have not existed since 1981 as far as he knows. He noted that he will be asking them to consider the residents from South Houcks Road to Valley Road to Locust Lane and Susquehanna Township as they are all members of the Colonial Park Organization.

Mr. Seeds questioned if individuals would be showing up who would have the authority to make decisions as far as the ground is concerned. Mr. Luetchford answered that according to the bylaws, they do. He noted that they are the only ones who have the authority.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if the T-ball field is still at Mateer Field. Mr. Luetchford answered yes. Ms. Lindsey noted that there is a T-ball field and a midget field so if we moved the front field from the Public Works facility, and they played at Mateer they would not be losing anything since they would have two fields. Mr. Blain noted that it is a nice field. Ms. Lindsey questioned if they have an electronic scoreboard. Mr. Blain answered that they have a batting cage and that is something they don't have now. Mrs. Lindsey noted that there is a concession stand as well.

Mr. Weaver noted that he was involved with the Mateer people when they decided to shut it down and there was a brief discussion with PHR to allow them to use the field for their T-ball program having their own concession stand but it was turned down by another party who was a part of the Colonial Park organization. He noted that PHR did at one time have some ideas for using that field.

Ms. Lindsey suggested that it may not be a problem now.

Mr. Hawk noted that he likes the overall plan and there are many details to work out and if we follow Mr. Seeds suggestion maybe Mr. Wolfe can work out some of the details. Mr. Blain noted that CASA and Paxton Baseball appreciate your time and he hopes that we can work out something that will be beneficial to all involved.

Mr. Seeds questioned if anyone was present from Linglestown Baseball. Mr. Weaver answered no. He noted that he spoke with them and they are perfectly fine with this.

Mr. Crissman noted that he appreciates having the discussion now rather than waiting until we build the facility and at the last minute, discussing all this.

Mr. Weaver noted that our season starts in March and we have no other field in the Township to use and he needs to know if he will have to reach out to another surrounding township to use it for a year. Mr. Crissman stated that we don't know either.

Status report regarding the clean fill project at the Wolfersberger Tract

Mr. Wolfe noted that he wants to explain where we stand with the contractor in regard to this project. He noted, in doing this, we may have created an issue for the paintball operation and we want to discuss that with the Board as well.

Mr. Steve Fleming, HRG, Inc., noted that the current status for the contract is that he has issued the contract documents to the contractor and is waiting for him to complete their insurance certificate, sign the agreement, and return them to HRG, after which he will forward the documents to the Township. He noted at that time he will have a preconstruction meeting and the project will commence.

Mr. Wolfe questioned what the expected start date is. Mr. Fleming answered that it should be within 30 days to start.

Mr. Fleming noted that regarding the paintball business that operates on the northern tract property, he met with staff to discuss ways in which we could facilitate access through the construction at least for the next 12 months. He noted that he will have to coordinate this with the contractor, noting that it is in the contract documents that it is feasible to install a temporary roadway that the contractor would use for access to the site to a certain point and then create a

construction access to the fill area to allow for a driveway to continue on to the paintball business located on the northern tract of property and allow for appropriate gates and parking traffic in the respective areas.

Mr. Luetchford noted that we are looking at a 12-month window, noting that we have a construction site to deal with and grades to be changed. He noted that the paintball business uses the driveway and the parking area. He noted that the parking area is due to be stripped, grubbed, and everything changed and fill will be placed and it will be unusable at that point for any parking. He noted that there is no established parking anywhere else on the property other than what they are currently using. He explained that we need to make changes to the back 40 acre tract or we have to do some other arrangement. He noted at a certain point in time the driveway does become unusable as it will become a construction zone, and there is some concern about that.

Mr. Luetchford noted that a couple years ago, we completed the Wolfersberger Park Plan and it did not include all forty acres to be used for paintball anyway. He noted that there were to be fields that were lent for potential paintball sites. He noted that they currently have 13 paintball fields and there is no way to maintain that number of fields regardless of what happens. He noted that the plan does include paintball and he has expressed his concern to the owners of the current paintball business. He noted that he questioned if paintball can survive with other park activities. He noted that he does not have any examples nationwide but he has done some searching and has not come up with an example of paintball working well within a park facility.

Mr. Luetchford noted that there are questions for how access will take place and if it is possible to continue the paintball operation and what the future will be for paintball on this property.

Ms. Lindsey noted that it will be about 12 months that they will be dumping dirt in the front 50 acres. Mr. Fleming answered that the total project will be longer than that but he anticipates a 12-month window until we would get to the area that would impact the driveway and the parking area the paintball is currently using on the property that we are looking to fill. Mrs. Lindsey noted that there was a sixty-day notice that the Township... Mr. Wolfe noted that memo was a draft and what we included in the packet was the license agreement with the

paintball group and a draft notice of termination. He noted at some point in time, if the Board would ever choose to do so, that is what the letter would look like. He noted that we are not saying that you need to do that now. He noted that we are saying that we have 12 months but after that we need to have a serious discussion on the future of the use of our property and what it would look like.

Mr. Crissman noted that coupled with Mr. Luetchford's review of how it fits in with programs around the country. He questioned Mr. Luetchford if he was just beginning the research or if he knew of any that currently exist and are successful or not successful. Mr. Luetchford answered that he has not found any yet but those discussions will have to occur for us to adequately plan the park.

Mr. Hawk noted, at this time, we can work together but the rubber will meet the road at some point down the road. Mr. Wolfe noted at some point in time the Park and Recreation Board, in discussion with the paintball tenant and the Board of Supervisors has to determine what it wants to do on the back 40 acres; if it will have paintball, how much will be paintball, and if you do make that type of arrangement what you would do with the entity that is currently providing paintball. He noted that none of that has to be decided tonight. He noted that it has been worked out that access can be provided for the 12-month period, but within that 12-month period we have a lot of planning to do.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if the paintball people are aware that it would be 12 months because she was under the understanding that it would be 60 days. Mr. Luetchford explained that we only had that discussion this morning and we are trying to figure a way... Mr. Wolfe noted that there are two things going on here. He noted that the 60-days is if we act in accordance with the license agreement; but we are not acting in accordance with the license agreement. He explained what he is saying is given the way Mr. Fleming has structured the construction effort it will be 12 months before we have to issue.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if the paintball people are aware of that. Mr. Wolfe answered no as we are talking to the Board tonight for the first time on this topic.

Mr. Hawk noted that he has never been to the paintball location; is it fashioned in such a way that it is not movable. Mr. Luetchford answered that paintball by its nature uses obstacles

some are concrete but most are wooden boxes, different obstacles that they use. He noted that paintball locations can be moved and the obstacles are a means of taking cover as it is a military exercise so you are looking to take cover and move to different areas of cover. He noted that it can be moved, some more easily than others. He noted that you are not talking about complete buildings or heaving structures. Mr. Hawk noted if it is movable is it something that can be still incorporated in the park at a different location.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if anyone is present from the paintball business.

Mr. Daniel Summey noted that he lives in Colonial Park and is one of the three owners of Linglestown Paintball. He noted that they are here to listen to what is going on as the issue with the lane is why he is present. He noted before he gets into it, the other two owners are Sean Reed, who is a police officer who lives in Linglestown, and Greg Smith who lives in Halifax. He noted that Sean Reed's father John Reed is also present.

Mr. Summey noted that he has been in business for about 20 years and it is a benefit to the community as it brings in commerce. He explained that he recently added a shop in the square of Linglestown beside the old Leo's Pizza so when people leave Koons Park they will see our business.

Mr. Summey noted that local families come out for birthday parties, and schools use the facilities as well as corporations. He noted that it also keeps kids from using paintball and aerosol BB guns that can be used in the backyard or wooded area that Wall Mart and Dick's Sporting Goods sells. He noted if there is no parental guidance, they can be very dangerous things. He noted that he has referees at his facility that watch what is going on and they are very strict on safety.

Ms. Lindsey questioned how many days a week the facility is open. Mr. Summey answered that they are open almost every weekend of the year, 12 months a year, and during the week, for example he has had UPS, Yellow Pages and other companies conduct corporate team building training. He noted that numerous colleges and schools have come in during the week as they don't want to use the facility on the weekend. He noted that he is open during the week but not every day as it might be every two or three weeks when they have something scheduled.

Ms. Lindsey noted that Mr. Summey's main concern is the access road. Mr. Summey answered yes noting that he has talked to the local farmer about access, that is not looking great. He noted that the farmer is leasing the land from Mr. Yingst but he is not sure how that is going yet. He stated that he is trying to get access in lieu of going across the front 50-acres and it is becoming an issue.

Ms. Lindsey noted that there was a question about moving the different things. Mr. Summey explained that he has pallets that can be ripped down and air bunkers which are like a big beach ball, big cubes and triangles, so that field is very movable. He noted that it can be taken down and put up within an hour and a half. He noted that it would not be sitting on the ground looking like trash. He noted when Mr. Luetchford mentioned having boxes, like old crates, noting that most of the stuff is made out of wood and it won't hurt the environment.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if we could move the road a little bit for them in the next year but we can't promise anything after that. Mr. Fleming answered that the plan would be to improve the existing lane back to a certain point, and we need to do that for the construction traffic that will be entering, the heavy tri-axles with the fill material, so we will need to stabilize the road with milled asphalt material. He noted that it would stabilize the entrance drive to create a mud free entrance for the construction vehicles, so from a certain point the driveway location will stay the same and it will be improved to a wider width in more stable condition. He noted beyond that he will create a construction entrance so that dump trucks will enter a fill zone and then paintball traffic can continue down the existing lane.

Ms. Lindsey noted that they are probably looking at a year that they could still keep the paintball. Mr. Fleming answered yes, noting that the entrance drive is one of the initial stages of the fill project so that would happen right away and as the site is filled from the Wenrich Street side of the project, moving towards the rear of the property in that manner he would preserve the driveway in that location for as long as they possibly can. He noted that he estimates that it will be 12 months until they get to that point.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if there would be no access after that time period to get back to the paintball facility. Mr. Fleming answered that it is too hard to tell at this point as it will depend on the sewer projects and how quickly they generate the material as we can only go so

far as how we dictate to the contractor. Mr. Wolfe noted that this is a construction project and we will connect both parcels, but the question is how long will it take. He noted that we do have a plan for the front half and back half and it could or could not include paintball and what the Township needs to do, along with the Park and Recreation Board, and Paintball people, is determine what will happen to the facility and what we do in 2016 and beyond.

Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Luetchford is collecting data and he assumed that Mr. Summey would have some information to share with him in terms of how the program could integrate into our Park and Recreation Program that would be good. He noted for the next 12 months we have a construction road going in but most of the work would be done during the week when the paintball doesn't have traffic coming in except on occasions since the bulk of your activities occurs on the weekend. He noted that it should not be a problem during the next 12 months.

Mr. Summey noted that the original plans that Mr. Luetchford shared with him showed Warren Avenue connecting to Wenrich Street, will be an access to the back 39 acres, but the 12 months until we get there, or if the road was created in 2016 that is the issue. He noted that Mr. Yingst has some plans with the Township about turning Warren Avenue into an access to the back 40 acres.

Mr. Luetchford noted when planning was done for Wolfersberger Park, it was found that the current driveway in the area has an over-vertical and is very difficult to maneuver with a poor sight-line resulting in a bad location for a permanent driveway. He noted that the intention from a planning standpoint was to access the park by way of Warren Avenue assuming that there will be a time when Mr. Yingst is going to develop that property. He noted if it happens, great, if it doesn't happen we will have to come up with another alternative. He noted that there is a possibility that Mr. Yingst or whoever owns the property in the future may wish to develop the land and line up the driveway with Warren Avenue to move directly into the property which may also go into the back 40 acres. He noted that it is planned that way but it doesn't mean it will happen that way, he noted that is why we are thinking about an alternative driveway, not including the front 50 acres that will allow it to go through Mr. Yingst's property.

Mr. Crissman noted for the first 12 months everything should be copasetic. Mr. Luetchford answered that is true, as he is talking with the contractor who will be doing the grading, and he believes that it will buy staff some time, for the next 12 months, in order to have further discussions. Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Luetchford needs to get more information and the Board needs to look at the overall plan for what will happen beyond 12 months.

Mr. Summey noted that this is evolving into a park on the back 40 and he and his other two partners are talking about, if there is no room for Linglestown Paintball, he might be able to move within the next ten to 15 years.

Mr. Hawk noted that we have some time to work this through, but having been a business owner for 22 years, he hates to see someone displaced due to circumstances that come up. Mr. Summey noted that the business has been around for 20 plus years. He explained that he bought it from the previous owner in 2012 and has been working with Mr. Heitzelman since 1992 which puts him over 20 years in the industry. He noted that the same is true with Greg Smith.

Ms. Lindsey noted that it keeps kids off the street as they have something to do. She noted that her son went there and he is now 32 years old. She explained that he went there when he was in 5th and 6th grade for birthday parties. She noted that Mr. Luetchford is getting more data, and Mr. Summey can do the same and it would be good if they stay informed. Mr. Hawk noted that it is hard to be a success in today's day and age and the door is open and we need to keep the lines of communication open.

Request from the Devonshire Memorial United Brethren in Christ Church to amend the Zoning Ordinance regarding impervious coverage in the R-1 District

Mr. Wolfe noted that representing this proposal is Tim Mellott on behalf of his client Devonshire Memorial United Brethren in Christ Church who may pursue a zoning amendment but they haven't filed the application yet. He suggested that they attended a workshop session prior to going through the formal process to inform you of their thoughts and to discuss it with the Board on an informal basis.

Mr. Tim Mellott, Mellott Engineering introduced Gary Gardner, a member of the Building Committee for the Devonshire Memorial United Brethren in Christ Church. He noted

that he would like to review the text amendment which is a stand-alone item and explained what they are trying to do.

Mr. Mellott noted that the text amendment would increase the maximum impervious coverage for institutional uses only that are permitted within the R-1 zoning District. He noted that it is now limited to a 40% for all permitted uses. He explained that he is looking to increase it to 60% but when he met with Mr. Wolfe and Mrs. Zerbe and were talking about it, the thought was that the institutional type uses are more appropriate to have an increase in impervious coverage. He noted institutional uses require a big buffer, a 30 foot wide vegetative buffer that goes around the perimeter of the property that abuts any residential use. He noted that the green aspect of the change really doesn't affect any of the neighboring areas as you still have a nice green buffer that is required. He noted that it allows you to utilize the internal portion of the property more effectively. He noted that the increase in coverage is only for the institutional uses in the R-1 District. He noted that a list of those uses was provided in the packet. He provided a list of those uses, such as a church, community center, which is what he will discuss as part of the proposal, noting that it has nothing to do with stormwater management. He noted that all aspects of that would follow through as per the State and Township requirements.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if the church and parsonage will be located next to this building. She questioned if it is proposed to be put in the vacant lot where the house was torn down. Mr. Mellott answered that the church and parking lot are on two separate lots, he showed the facility as it is today. He noted that the parsonage was just removed, and they joined an additional property to the church a while back when they did a minor building addition to add an elevator. He noted that the church is existing and they have purchased additional properties and are considering purchasing a third property to move forward with the proposed project. He noted they will probably have a conditional type sale agreement if they can move forward with the project.

Mr. Hawk questioned what the church owns. Mr. Mellott answered that they own everything inside the yellow line except for one property. He noted that they purchased additional property to assist with the parking issues but now they want to incorporate a community center with the property.

Mr. Crissman questioned if it encompasses the piece that the church does not own yet but is anticipating to purchase. Mr. Mellott answered yes. He noted that they would all be joined together. Mr. Crissman noted that the one property the church does not own yet. Mr. Mellott explained that with the buffering around the perimeter of a non-residential use against a residential use, it accomplished the intent of maintaining the green and the buffer. He noted if we don't get the relief the church would have less parking. Mr. Crissman questioned what the swimming pool is for. Mr. Mellott answered that it would be the stormwater facility. He noted that project would be a massive enhancement. He noted that he left the area white to show the existing parking, and highlighted the new stuff. Mr. Crissman questioned if the new parking has water running off the impervious coverage down onto the street onto Devon Road. Mr. Mellott noted that there is an issue and he is putting a roll curb in the area to control all the water to get it into the storm sewer and pipe it to where it should go now. He noted that the entire development drains down into the common property line so not only will you get storm water management for all the new impervious coverage but we will take the roof leaders from the existing church into it and provide some non-controlled development.

Mr. Crissman noted that his concern is with the residents who live close to Devon Drive. He noted that everything is green, and you will have a retention pond and you are not adding any additional parking, noting that parking is up above. He noted that there are three homes behind the church property. Mr. Mellott noted that we also have trees in that area. Mr. Crissman questioned if the drainage from the top of the parking will go down over the hill into those three homes. Mr. Mellott answered absolutely not. Mr. Crissman questioned why. Mr. Mellott answered that he would design the plan properly for the collection of stormwater.

Mr. Gardner noted that topographically he pointed to two high areas and showed the low areas on the map. Mr. Mellott noted that the water will drain away from those three homes.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that the piece of property that the church intends to purchase, have you been in contact with those people. Mr. Mellott answered yes. Mr. Gardner noted that we have an unsigned contract hoping to work with them.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if anyone has spoken to the residents in the surrounding area. Mr. Gardner answered that he spoke to one owner as they were contemplating purchasing that

property as well. He noted that everyone on that street is familiar with the church as many have attended church and they have been involved with the church. He noted that everyone sort of knows what is going on. Mr. Crissman answered that sort of doesn't count. Mr. Gardner answered that he did not talk to every neighbor. Mr. Crissman questioned if the water drains to the center area, do you have some wiggle room. Mr. Mellott answered that he was not sure where it drains but he will do collection. Mr. Crissman noted that once the project is complete we don't want the neighbors coming in to complain why the Board allowed the project as they now have water in their backyard and in the basement and they never had that experience before.

Mr. Wolfe noted at this stage, we are not at the subdivision land development phase. Mr. Crissman noted that he understands as he is jumping ahead. Mr. Wolfe noted that they are asking for a text amendment to the zoning ordinance that if approved would accommodate this type of use but it would not approve this use.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Mellott if he considered a conditional use. Mr. Gardner answered that we discussed those options. Mr. Mellott stated that they felt that it was better to go for a text amendment recognizing that the impact on the district is so low because of the allowable uses that we are talking about. He questioned how often you will have a community center proposed in an R-1 District.

Mr. Seeds noted that the buffer of the trees from the neighborhood would be a condition of the plan. Mr. Mellott explained if we were seeking a variance he would recognize the communication would be extremely important but, at this level, the buffers that are required for the property would still be required. He noted that buildings can't be within 30 feet of the property line under any circumstances. Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Mellott if he did any research for how many R-1 properties have institutional use. Mr. Mellott answered no.

Ms. Lindsey questioned what the community center will have in it. Mr. Gardner answered that it would be a facility that would have gym like qualities, offices, the relocation of a pre-school that is now operating out of the church, and it would provide an indoor recreation facility.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if there would be one way in and one way out. Mr. Mellott answered yes. Ms. Lindsey suggested that you need to contact the neighbors behind the property and to the side as it looks like it would be a pretty big building.

Mr. Gardner noted that it will be larger but in the same vicinity of the office as they would be removing the other houses.

Mr. Mellott noted that these are all permitted uses by right.

Mr. Seeds noted that he would be concerned what effect it would have on the other properties that already have an institutional use for the long term effect because if we do this it will effect all the R-1 properties that are now or could be institutional. Mr. Wolfe noted that most of the zoning for institutional uses has it in its own separate district. He noted that there are very few schools, churches, and government buildings that are free standing in an R-1 district. He noted that this amendment would have limited impact on other uses. Mr. Seeds questioned if staff has looked at this and does it have a recommendation. Mr. Wolfe answered that zoning is at the prerogative of the Board but he suggested that it would have limited impact upon uses within the Township.

Mr. Hawk noted that going from 40 square feet to 60 square feet is not going to have a major impact on the Township. Mr. Wolfe answered yes as it is only applicable to institutional uses in a residential zone and most of the Township's institutional uses are already in an institutional zone so it would apply to very few uses within the Township.

Mr. Hawk noted that going back to Mrs. Lindsey's comments, that Devon Road goes into a semi-circle and there are a limited number of homes. Mr. Wolfe noted if the Board agrees that this should be a zoning amendment that the applicant would have to demonstrate that although it is a text amendment that the property owners in the area don't have an objection to this. Mr. Crissman noted that he would like to have this resolved well before it comes to the Board. Mr. Seeds noted that he would like to hear from Mr. Fleming. Mr. Wolfe noted that typically we don't get an engineer's opinion on a text amendment. He noted that you will get one from the Planning Commission and from Dauphin County Planning Commission.

Mr. Mellott noted if 50% is more appropriate he could consider that but 60% was what staff came up with thinking that it was the appropriate amount. Mr. Seeds questioned how much

would the plan be. Mr. Mellott answered that it would be 44%. Mr. Hawk noted if you bump it up to 50% it would provide a leeway. Mr. Mellott noted that we cannot expand a non-conforming and the existing is way over coverage so we wouldn't be held to that but if the change is done the overall project would come back as one. He noted that there is a certain amount of greens space associated with the existing lots that he showed previously, and he would need to maintain that plus whatever the percentage requirement is. Mr. Seeds noted that you are over that as you were grandfathered in. Mr. Mellott answered for that, but if the change would make the overall project in compliance, he is not asking for a 44% change. He noted one of the key things with this from an institutional standpoint is you have these large buffers around the property that is providing the green space. He noted if you had 100 acres and the green buffers around it, what does it matter what is happening internal to the site. He noted that the landscape buffering requirements accomplished the green space allowing the internal use of the property more effective.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the institutional district or institutional uses has a maximum percent building coverage of 60% and that is why that was chosen for an institutional use in a residential district. He noted the institutional uses are permitted uses, such as schools, churches and municipal buildings. He noted that they are also permitted uses in the R-1 District. He noted the R-1 District allows a 40% maximum coverage but in the Institutional District it is currently 60%. He noted that they are asking for the 40% in the R-1 to match the 60% in the Institutional. Mr. Mellott noted recognizing that the additional buffers as institutional does not have the buffer requirement against institutional.

Mr. Seeds questioned if a buffer is not required in an institutional zoning. Mr. Wolfe answered that it does not have the buffer requirement. Mr. Seeds noted that we need to look at that.

Mr. Wolfe noted if you look at the chart the maximum building coverage in the institutional zone is 60% for institutional uses but the maximum impervious coverage is 75%. He noted in an institutional district, a church, school or municipal building can have greater impervious.

Mr. Hawk noted that the workshop is the opportunity to have conversation to work out the details and concerns and he noted that the impervious coverage is not the main problem, but he needs to get a buy in from the rest of the people on Devon Road.

Mr. Mellott noted that he understands that the Board is concerned for the people who abut the property and it is a reasonable request. Mr. Hawk noted that when you make a decision it will impact a certain group of people within the Township and the people who live on Devon Road are worthy of consideration.

Mr. Hawk noted that it provides some legwork for what Mr. Mellott needs to do before he comes back again.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if the Township recommended a text amendment or variance. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is staff's opinion that this would be better handled as a text amendment.

Mr. Mellott noted that a hardship would be very difficult to justify. Mr. Crissman noted that he would like all the neighbors in the area to be contacted. Mr. Mellott questioned the best way to do this. Mr. Wolfe suggested that you use the church as a meeting place to invite the neighbors to discuss the issue.

Discussion with McNaughton Homes regarding proposed improvements
to Patton Road in conjunction with the Estates at Autumn Oaks

Mr. Wolfe noted when the Estates of Autumn Oaks was approved as a land development plan in Lower Paxton Township it came along with a roadway improvement agreement providing for the realignment of Patton Road. He noted that Patton Road at the toe of the hill has a significant S curve as it crosses over a stream. He noted that the purpose for the roadway realignment was for the developer to take corrective action to realign the roadway as it crosses the stream. He noted that the agreement provided for the realignment to occur within a specific period of time as identified in the terms of the agreement and it was based upon phasing as the development progressed. He noted that the phasing schedule was modified but we are now getting to the point in time where the developer will need to proceed with the improvements to Patton Road. He noted that this was discussed in previous workshop session roughly nine months to a year ago, but we have not come to any conclusion or plan of action and Mr. Joel McNaughton is here to discuss this.

Mr. Joel McNaughton, McNaughton Company thanked Mr. Wolfe for the introduction. He thanked the Board for taking the time to discuss this agenda item. He noted that with the approval of Autumn Oaks there was an agreement reached between the McNaughton Company and the Township to perform certain improvements to Patton Road. He noted that he is pleased to report that he is nearing a threshold set forth in the agreement to move forward with some improvements to Patton Road and he thinks that it is a testament to the Township and the Autumn Oaks development. He noted that it is one of the most desirable locations for people to come and reside within the Township, and he wanted to thank the Board and staff for the good working conditions for the project.

Mr. McNaughton noted about a year ago he came to the Board and talked about the same issue with Patton Road. He explained, at the time, it was based upon his observation of being out at the site noting that he has friends and family that live at the site, and finding, outside of the typical work day that when people are coming to the site and leaving they are not using Patton Road. He noted that they are going out Continental Drive to Colonial Road to the traffic light at Linglestown and Colonial Roads. He noted that he came to the Board a little over a year ago and describe what his observations were and asked if the Township would authorize the Police Department to conduct a traffic study for what is going on at Patton Road.

Mr. McNaughton noted that the traffic study was completed and traffic counts were taken and analyzed, and the preliminary analysis determined that people may still be using Patton Road and that the road should be realigned to help facilitate the safe travel along Patton Road out to Linglestown Road. He noted that he received the initial report and accepted it and said okay for what was happening even though it did not seem to him that was what was happening. He noted as he is moving closer to doing the improvements to Patton Road he looked at the police traffic counts and what jumped out right away was when you looked at the traffic counts for Patton Road he noticed an anomaly. He noted in a normal residential development the peak hour trips are in the morning when you are leaving to go to work and in the evening you are returning to your home from work. He noted that typically you would see a lot of traffic leaving the site in the morning and returning back in the evening. He noted that traffic counts for Patton Road were completely the opposite. He noted in the morning, everyone was coming to the Autumn Oaks

site and in the evening they were leaving it. He noted that it didn't make sense and it is not what people do and he surmised that it is a temporary phenomenon caused by the construction activities. He noted in the morning, the drywallers, excavators, inspectors, and all those folks are coming to their work site. He noted in the evening they are leaving going to their homes. He noted that it is causing artificial influence on the traffic counts along Patton Road.

Mr. McNaughton noted if you look at the preexisting traffic and the number of units that exist at Autumn Oaks you can pretty much determine what type of trips would be generated in the am and pm peak hours, leaving and coming to the site. He noted that there is much less traffic traveling on Patton Road than what the anticipated amount would be. He suggested that 30 or more trips in a peak hour, one trip every two minutes is pretty significant. He suggested that his observations are correct, and for a daily basis, which was the way the police traffic study was conducted, it looks like people using Patton Road, and those numbers are temporary numbers due to the phenomenon, it is a work site for a whole lot of people. He noted that it is a good thing from a planning standpoint, noting that the way you want the people to leave Autumn Oaks is to go down Continental Drive and turn onto Colonial Road as there are no driveways off of Colonial Road, staying away from the S turn, over-verticals and stop signs on Patton Road. He noted that it is a better way for traffic to use Colonial Road to come out at a light.

Mr. McNaughton noted in the Patton Road, Continental Drive and Colonial Road corridor there are some pre-existing drainage issues in that area. He noted a few years ago when we were having those major downpours storm events, there were times when some of the intersections become impassable. He noted that Public Works Department has blocked those intersections off and if you are in the development you couldn't get out, and if you were out, you couldn't get in.

Mr. McNaughton suggested that we want people to drive Continental Drive and Colonial Road to get to Linglestown Road. He suggested that is the way that people are going and they are not using Patton Road.

Mr. McNaughton noted that there are some pre-existing stormwater issues in that area that he thinks would be the better invested in the Autumn Oaks area. He noted for Centennial Acres area; the better investment would be to cure those stormwater management issues. He

noted that it would benefit more people and would provide a more long-term benefit to the area and it would force people to go where we want them to go. He noted that they should not use Patton Road but use Continental Drive and Colonial Road. He noted that we should correct the stormwater issues so that we don't have those situations where there are some temporary inabilities to access Blue Hen and all those different roads that are north of Patton Road.

Mr. McNaughton noted that he is not attempting to avoid any of the work or investment that he agreed to make, noting that he had a certain understanding of what it would cost to repair and straighten Patton Road at the S turn and we know what that cost would be and he is here to say that he would like to take the money and use it elsewhere to repair stormwater issues and leave Patton Road the way it is. He noted that he wanted to discuss this option with the Board.

Mr. Hawk noted that he was looking at the agreement which called to realign Patton Road, but now the question is in lieu of doing the realignment on Patton Road you want to do what now. Mr. McNaughton answered that there are a number of existing stormwater management culverts underneath Continental Drive, Patton Road, as well as streams and drainage ways that run to the rear of Patton Road and Continental Drive. He noted that some of them have been filled in and blocked up over time. He noted that he would like to look at all those drains and culverts, streams and storm sewers to determine what is causing the flooding when it occurs. He noted that he wants to know where the issue is and what could be done, culvert replacements, storm sewer replacements, holding back the water in other places, noting that he has not explored all of those options. He noted in talking with his engineer there are things that could be done to address those flooding issues so when we do get the heavy rains, the water will drain and not back up into the roadways.

Ms. Lindsey questioned Mr. Fleming what his thoughts were on this presentation. Mr. Fleming noting that thinking back to the planning of this development and the discussion of traffic and understanding how the roads work north and south, some of the concern that was addressed for the Patton Road improvement involved that any traffic would use Patton Road had to transverse the roadway that had insufficient geometry in that section and culverts that frequently flood. He noted, in some instances the road had to be closed. He noted that prior to this development, the roadway there was no alternate route for when the road would flood and

with the realignment and the replacement of the culvert in that section the goal was to restore that as an alternative route for the development. He noted that while the traffic to and from the development maybe artificially distorted at this point, an alternate method may be considered. He noted that that he wanted to remind the Board of the goal to address any traffic that would be using Patton Road whether or not it was for a day-to-day basis as desirable or a secondary route that you would want to preserve. He noted if that proposed plan would be abandoned, he questioned how improvements to Patton Road would move forward. He noted if the money was not spent on the various Patton Road issues, what becomes of the roadway. He questioned if it would remain as it exists today or would some improvements be made to the roadway or does it become abandoned and cul-de-sacs installed. He stated that he was throwing out options.

Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. McNaughton indicated that he had a traffic study that indicated that the majority of the traffic is using Continental and Colonial and that the workman are using Patton Road. He questioned if was better to use Continental and Colonial why didn't the workmen also use those roads. Mr. McNaughton answered when the counts were analyzed, they were just looked at on a daily basis and at that intersection. He noted that people are in and out of here a lot but it was never looked at what is going on hour by hour. He noted the he looked at the study a little closer, knowing what sort of development is going on and based on the development for how many cars are generated. He noted that he can determine that and as you run the cars out of the site, to disperse the traffic, noting if these people would be using Patton Road, this is the number of trips that would be anticipated. He noted that we know that number based on the traffic counts and the number of trips anticipated to be in the upper area and the number of actual traffic counts that were read on Patton Road. He noted when you look at it hour by hour this gap represents people not using Patton Road but going the other way.

Mr. Crissman noted that the comment you made was that it was the workers coming and going out but why were they not using Colonial Road. Mr. McNaughton suggested that they are but when the study was reviewed, the intersection as a whole was looked at as a more global basis across the entire scope of the day. He noted that it was numbers for who was coming and who was leaving the site through that intersection. He noted that they did not look at the detail for which way are they driving and when.

Ms. Lindsey questioned how many more units will be built. Mr. McNaughton noted for an occupied standpoint, when the report was completed two months ago, over 50%. He noted that 75% of the construction is done and we have approvals for Phase 2. He noted that we are halfway done from an approval standpoint, and from a construction standpoint something less, and from an occupancy standpoint, maybe slightly over 25%.

Mr. Seeds questioned how many times a year you think Patton Road would have to be closed because water runs over the surface of the roadway. He questioned with the improvements that Mr. McNaughton is proposing, would the stormwater improvements alleviate the problem. He noted that he is looking at getting the most bang for the buck. He questioned if we can correct the flooding problems with what you are proposing or do we need to do the approved plan that exists now. He questioned if we raised the road and did some stormwater improvements noting that you are planning to spend the same amount of dollars but you are saying that it is a better proposal to do the stormwater on Continental as it would alleviate more problems than straightening the road. He suggested that we need to look at it with your engineer and our engineer to see where we will get the most bang for the buck. Mr. McNaughton answered that is exactly what we want to do. He noted that the question is where is the main issue and where does most of the flooding occur. He noted that the current culvert in Patton Road has a turn that he would align and it does flood, but the other location where it floods is the intersection of Patton Road and Continental Drive. He noted if Patton Road is realigned, the folks can make their way back Patton Road but when they get to Continental Drive at Patton Road the intersection could be blocked off. Mr. Seeds questioned if it floods a lot. Mr. McNaughton noted that even if it is once or twice a year, it is too many times that those folks, whether or not Patton road is fixed, cannot get out or cannot get in. Mr. Seeds questioned if they can't get across Continental Drive. Mr. McNaughton answered yes. He noted that is the main issue that he would like to repair. Mr. Seeds noted that they have no way out. Mr. McNaughton answered exactly.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Fleming or Mr. Robbins if that is true. Mr. Robbins answered that he is not aware of the issue but he is aware of the culvert coming off of Continental going south, noting that that pipe does top several times a year. Mr. Seeds questioned if that is at

Continental and Patton. Mr. Robbins noted that the culvert that he is referring to is located on Patton Road south of Continental Drive. He noted that he is not aware of any issue on Continental Drive.

Mr. Hawk noted that the purpose of the workshop is to come to an understanding of which is the best way to solve the problem. He noted that there is a curvature and flooding so what is the best way to solve the problem, is it straightening the road, concentrating on the flooding, but if he lived in Autumn Oaks he wouldn't want to run the risk of driving through water to get home. He suggested that he would be willing to put up with a curve in the road so he questioned what the basic problem is and what the solutions to the problem are. He noted in order to get to that point we need to know what is causing it and if you can eliminate the cause, chances are your problem is half solved if not completely solved. He suggested that the real problem is the water. Mr. McNaughton answered that is what he believes to be the real problem. He noted the better way to make an improvement to that area is to address the stormwater issues up and down Patton Road and to make the entire corridor better from a stormwater management.

Mr. Hawk questioned if straightening the road would eliminate driving through water or does some other method solve his problem. Mr. Fleming noted the proposal this evening is to find out if the Board is interested in pursuing other alternatives understanding that the drainage in that area, the culvert in the S-turn will be a lot more difficult and expensive to address than some of the other smaller culvert pipes that are located at Continental Drive and Patton Road and maybe elsewhere along Continental Drive. He noted that Mr. McNaughton is proposing that we take the funds budgeted to fix Patton Road and the roadway geometry and undergo a significant project that would still, in all reality, with the topography on either side of the road probably still flood during a storm event just because it is a low lying area. He noted that he wants to look at some of the more nuisance problems and preserve the other routes of traffic with the understanding that Patton Road may still be closed at some point but you would be preserving access in and out of the development by making other improvements that weren't originally proposed.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned Mr. McNaughton if he would replace the culvert at the S-turn. Mr. McNaughton answered that it seems like it is one of the places that probably should be

addressed. Mrs. Lindsey questioned Mr. Robbins if that is the one that really floods. Mr. Robbins noted that he did not make himself clear, he was referring to culverts near the intersection of Continental and Patton Road. He noted that he is not aware of any culverts that top other than that intersection. He noted that the culvert in the S-turn floods periodically, noting that he is putting up barricades a number of times in the year.

Mr. Seeds suggested that Mr. Fleming, Mr. Robbins and Mr. McNaughton should get together to discuss this and if there is more work to be done over what the McNaughton Company has offered as improvements, then maybe we need to look at Township funds so we can correct the problem. He noted that we need to know what it would cost to correct those issues.

Mr. Hawk noted that he is at a point where he can flip flop but it would be nice if you could do both of them, the issue with the water in the road, but it is expensive to do, but we need to solve the major problems. He suggested that Mr. Seeds has a good idea, and maybe we need to take another look at this.

Mr. McNaughton noted that his purpose for coming is that it is his belief that the better improvement, noting that we are committing to making an investment to that corridor, and it is his belief that the better improvement is to handle the stormwater issues so that in all situations, no matter what storm you are in, you may have to go over a road that is slightly curvy, but at least you can go over it. He noted that doing the stormwater repair allows you to always maintain the two ways in and out of the Autumn Oaks site. He noted that he does not want to go too far down the road to start working with engineers and wetland experts and all these different folks to explore what the stormwater repairs should be if the Board is saying it only wants Patton Road fixed, and let's not worry about the stormwater issues.

Mr. Hawk noted that he would be willing to ride over to the location to look at both issues to get a better feel. Mr. Crissman noted that he would suggest that Mr. McNaughton reduce to writing his proposal in terms of a formal proposal, point by point. He noted that we have an opportunity to turn it over to the engineering firm to have them review it and then get the parties together to discuss what can be done with the dollars allotted.

Mrs. Lindsey explained that she asked Mr. Wolfe if there were any accidents at the S-curve and he stated that he did not think so. Mr. Wolfe noted that he is sure that there have been accidents but not a significant amount at this point.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Crissman's recommendation is a good one and he would be willing to meet with Mr. McNaughton as well. Mr. Crissman noted if it is reduced to writing we will know point-by-point what can be done, what can't be done, and where the problems are.

Discussion regarding the Townes at Galway land development plan

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board has seen this plan at a previous business meeting and instead of taking action, you directed that it be sent back to the Fire and EMS personnel for continued review, given concerns that people had in regard to access to the development. He noted that at least two meetings were held with the Chief Swank of the Colonial Park Fire Company and the Township Fire Marshall participated as well and a plan with revisions is available for the Board members to review this evening. He noted that it will be presented by Edward Black, of H. Edward Black and Associates.

Mr. Edward Black explained that he is with the firm of H. Edward Black and Associates and with him is his son, Chris Black who is one of the persons who has control of the site. He noted that he has been before the Board before and he felt that the plan was posed for approval; however, there was some concern on the part of the Emergency Services Personnel that they would not be able to get fire trucks through the area especially if people were parked on the street. He noted as a result of the two meetings that Mr. Wolfe referenced, it is fair to say that he came up with the plan of painting the curb red and adding the lettering for fire lanes in front of the fire lane for several locations. He noted when it is painted like that, it is enforceable as a no parking zone by the police. He noted that cars would not be permitted to park there and if they do they would be towed.

Mr. Black noted that Chief Swank had a concern about having to put the outriggers down from a piece of apparatus and not having a firm foundation to do that. He noted that they came to the agreement that a piece of sidewalk that he pointed to on the plan would be a heavier type of concrete paving so that the outriggers on the fire apparatus could be placed there. He

suggested that it should alleviate the concerns and it does make it possible for the fire company to fight any possible fire that may unfortunately take place there.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the roads would continue to be 24 feet in width. Mr. Black answered yes.

Mr. Black noted that you do have other 24 foot wide streets in the Township. Mrs. Lindsey noted that she was not sitting on the Board at that time. Mr. Black noted that it was agreed that the roads would stay at 24 foot wide if he did some extra measures to make it possible to do what Chief Swank was concerned about.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Black if he was going to propose slant curbing. Mr. Black answered yes. Mr. Seeds questioned if it would be another waiver request. Mr. Black answered yes.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there is a connection of the sidewalk to Summerwood, the next street to the right. Mr. Black answered that there is no connection to that street. Mr. Seeds questioned if the earlier plan had a connection. Mr. Black answered no as it is a private street.

Mr. Seeds questioned where the sidewalks are proposed for the plan. Mr. Black pointed to the locations on the map. Mr. Wolfe explained that sidewalk is proposed for Newside Road. Mr. Chris Black noted that the walkway goes from the development to Newside Road. He noted that there is a widening of Newside Road and he will add a sidewalk across the front to tie in to the existing sidewalk on both sides. He noted that this is the only road frontage that does not have sidewalk.

Mr. Seeds noted that he can't image that the development will fit into that area with the retention pond. He noted the day that he was visiting it was not raining but water was crossing across that walk and it was kind of a wetlands inside the walkway. He noted that it was very wet. Mr. Chris Black questioned Mr. Seeds if he was closer to the cemetery. Mr. Seeds noted that he was halfway between the cemetery and Summerwood. He explained that it hadn't rained for a week.

Mr. Hawk noted that he was over at that location on Saturday and he experienced the same thought. He noted that there seems to be a lot of wetlands in a relatively small lot for 17 homes. He questioned how big the lot is, 2.5 acres. Mr. Edward Black answered 2.6 acres. Mrs.

Lindsey noted that she knows someone else who looked at the property and was told that it was too wet. Mr. Black noted that he has had an impact person and a wetland consultant on site and it was depicted on the plan and he will be doing some fill.

Mr. Seeds noted that the water from the impervious area will go up top somewhere. Mr. Chris Black answered yes as there is underground retention in the area of the parking lot. Mr. Seeds questioned where it goes to from there. Mr. Edward Black noted that depending on the percolation rate, noting that we have done percolation tests in the area. He noted that he used the firm of F. T. Kitlinski and Associates, Inc. for the geotechnical advice. Mr. Chris Black noted that he does not have the vital statistics but he can alleviate some of the concerns in that he is below the coverage by at least 10% as far as impervious coverage as well as building coverage so there is still ample green space on the property despite putting 17 units on the property.

Mr. Seeds noted that it hadn't rained within a week and it was very wet, especially in the area of the walk area. He noted that water was flowing over it. He noted he had a concern with adding more impervious but you are talking about an underground retention area and discussed percolation. He noted that the County and Township engineers will be looking at it for stormwater.

Ms. Lindsey questioned Mr. Fleming if he has looked at the site. Mr. Fleming answered that he reviewed the project. Mr. Chris Black noted that the project was posed for approval at the last business meeting but the concern at that time was in regards to emergency services having access which he had two meetings otherwise the comments, Township Engineer, and Dauphin County and so forth had been addressed. He suggested that the two meetings were successful.

Mr. Hawk noted that we have Chief Swank from Colonial Park and Chief Campbell from SCEMS in the audience. He suggested that it would be good to hear from them in regard to the memo.

Mr. Hawk noted that Chief Campbell had indicated that the emergency vehicles for SCEMS had no issues with accessing the development.

Chief Tom Swank noted that the plan was for 24 foot cartways and the code says that it must be 32 feet. He noted that he asked for that years ago. He noted that Mr. Black stated that

would stay at 24 feet as he put a private parking area in. He noted that Shadebrook is currently at 24 feet and they made improvements to that project. He noted that we had two meetings to discuss this noting that we are still at 24 feet with the recommendations through Mr. Black and Fire Marshall Rich Needham. He noted that we came up with the recommendations of painting the fire lanes so the police department can enforce if someone is parked in that location. He noted that we compromised that they would stay at 24 feet and have a parking lot and we would be where we are today.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that she goes back to Meadowview, the 24 foot cartways and the problem that the fire company has with fire apparatus in that development. Chief Swank noted that we could still have that problem getting in but he thinks the recommendations that they made to him, we might be able to make do with it, as it would be easier than Meadowview now, as it is 24 feet with no addition cushion, whereas we have some cushion here. He noted if we didn't make the compromise it would be a parking lot and we would be where we are today.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the fire apparatus can make the necessary turns. Chief Swank answered that they brought in the radius studies that Mrs. Zerbe provided to them and it does make it in there. Mrs. Lindsey noted that is if there are no cars parked on the side road. She noted that it can't be guaranteed even though there is a fire lane. Chief Swank answered that is correct.

Mr. Hawk noted that the Chief Campbell indicated that his units can access the site. Chief Campbell answered that ambulances are much smaller vehicles.

Mr. Hawk thanked both Chief Swank and Chief Campbell for their interest in this project.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that we still have the issues of the wetlands. She noted that Mr. Black stated that he is doing something under the parking lot. Mr. Black noted that the wetlands have been delineated and the parking lot is not in a wetland. He noted that the percolation rates will support subsurface disposal of the water. He noted that it has a storage area and the perk rate will allow it to go away.

Mr. Seeds noted that he still has concerns with the 24 foot streets, knowing for Shadebrook the alleys are 24 feet. He noted that Meadowview also has the same issue and he still has some concerns about it. He questioned if the plan is not due able.

Mr. Hawk noted that he is not concerned with the 24 feet as he is with the wetland aspect. Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Black is making his statement but our engineer will look at it and Dauphin County will look at it. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is before the Board with the waiver request as presented. He noted that there is no more County or Township Planning Commission review for this plan. He noted that the Planning Commission has recommended approval subject to Board action for the waivers.

Mr. Seeds questioned if anyone has brought up any red flags in regard to stormwater issues. Mr. Wolfe answered no. He questioned if Mr. Fleming could speak to the stormwater. Mr. Fleming answered that the calculations were complete and met the ordinance requirement. He noted that they submitted infiltration perk testing completed by Kitlinski Associates and we have reviewed his work before and he has no reason to question its legitimacy as the wetland study was done in conformance with the requirement to delineate a wetland in the field. He had no reason to question their professional judgment.

Mr. Hawk questioned Mr. Fleming from his standpoint does it look okay. Mr. Fleming answered yes.

Mr. Crissman noted that this needs to be returned to the agenda for next week's business meeting.

Continued discussion regarding proposed improvements to the Earl Drive culvert

Mr. Fleming noted that he and Mr. Robbins will meet later this week to plan next year's design projects and the culvert related to the Earl Drive drainage area on the list. He suggested that it would be good to discuss with the Board the original findings of the study, recap on the options that could be alternatives to the original study and go over what design project we will move forward with unless the Board provides other direction.

Mr. Fleming noted that the Earl Drive culvert goes underneath Earl Drive. He noted in the area of Harman Drive and Top View Drive there is an existing 100-year flood plain associated upstream of the that culvert that effects some properties. He noted that he has

indicated on the map which properties in particular when looking at the original study with one additional one, but the main properties he pointed to on a map. He noted as a result of the 2011 storms, the Board requested HRG to study this area, determine the cause of the flooding, and prepare a hydraulic model in order to analyze options to lower the 100-year flood plain elevation that effects some of these properties in a potential improvement for related culverts that need to be replaced or rehabilitated. He noted that the flooding condition that exists upstream of the Earl Drive culvert is in a designated flood plain. He noted that the property owners are required to have flood insurance and the properties are impacted in different ways. He noted that two of the properties are impacted meaning the floodwater has the potential to enter the home during that flooding condition.

Mr. Fleming noted that Earl Drive is an existing 11 x 7 corrugated structural arch pipe. He noted that pipe can handle the 100-year storm and you can almost walk through it comfortably if you crouch down. He noted that the culvert is in good condition but it will need some rehab work in the couple of years. He noted upstream of that, under Creek Drive, is an existing 36 inch metal pipe, the end pipe was replaced with a 40 inch pipe and he is proposing a 95” by 67” metal arch pipe, similar to the arch pipe that exists under Earl Drive. He noted that it will increase the capacity to alleviate the flooding that occurs at Creek Drive but it won’t increase the flood elevations downstream. He noted that it will provide relief to the smaller stream that exits upstream at Creek Drive. He noted that the pipe has been designed to pass a 50-year storm event that is in line with what the ordinance requires.

Mr. Fleming noted that he is proposing to rehabilitate the Earl Drive culvert based upon the field view as it is made of ten gauge steel, galvanized, which is protecting it from rust; however, due to some installation techniques some settlement has resulted and bulging and rusting that is starting to occur. He noted that he met with a metal arch manufacturer, Lane Enterprises, and reviewed the feasibility of actually taking the bottom out of the culvert and replacing it. He noted that the large arch pipes are constructed using metal panels and they bolt them together to form the pipe. He noted that they could unbolt or cut the bolts off, remove it panel by panel, replace the bottom, and restore the life of the culvert without impacting the hydraulics. He noted from a planning level estimate, the project will cost in the neighborhood of

\$100,000. He noted that the upstream culvert project is estimated to cost \$90,000, so the total cost would be \$190,000 without changing the water surface elevation. He noted that it would not have any impact on the 100-year flood elevation that impacts the properties.

Mr. Fleming noted the last time he was present he reviewed a couple of options to alleviate the flood condition. He noted that the first was to find a property and install a retention structure upstream to retain some of the flood water. He noted that he reviewed the watershed and he did not feel that there was enough property to build a flood structure like that. He noted that he even looked at using a structure like the Lakeside Marina. He noted that installing a structure the size and depth of the Marina that would remain empty only to become a flood control structure; but even a project that size did not significantly impact the flood elevation once you got to Earl Drive.

Mr. Fleming noted that the second option would be to recreate the channel as it flows near the backyards but that would only help during the smaller storms up to the 25-year storm. He noted beyond that the water still comes out of the channel. He noted that the area is very low lying and the stream banks are not high. He noted that some property owners have constructed some walls and done some other improvements to keep the stream in the channel but during a storm event it comes out fairly quickly. He noted that understanding that some private improvements would have to be removed, as well as easements procured, he did not recommend that option.

Mr. Fleming noted that the third option gets into replacing structures instead of rehabilitating structures. He noted it would be to replace the Earl Drive culvert with a much larger culvert essentially almost a bridge, a large box culvert structure, and expand the channel immediately upstream. He noted if you walk the channel, once you get to the culvert itself it is very narrow and very deep which causes the flood waters to stack up high in order to work itself through the culvert. He noted that the pipe will pass through a 100-year storm event but it causes a back water condition upstream in order to force the water through the culvert. He noted that he would take out the existing culvert, install a larger box culvert and expand the channel immediately upstream. He noted that it would involve the property immediately to the right and left and more than likely removing one of the homes in order to facilitate the larger structure.

Mr. Fleming noted that the other thing that impacts a replacement project is that there is an existing water line that runs along Earl Drive that sits over the culvert. He noted that a rehabilitation project was done on Top View Drive in coordination with the Water Company, the water line is a 16 inch water main under high pressure made of asbestos cement pipe which is common in the areas for water mains but it is problematic when you try to work around them as it is very brittle. He noted that the ground around the pipe is holding it together and as soon as you start to excavate it or try to cut it is susceptible to future leaks. He noted that the water company requires you to take extraordinary measures or to replace it for a significant length around the project to make sure they will have no problems when the project is done. He noted that the water component of that could potentially be a \$100,000 plus cost estimate. He noted that replacing the Earl Drive culvert and expanding the channel upstream to include property costs and water line costs would bring you in the area of \$700,000. He noted that the benefit at the 100-year storm event would be approximately one foot in an upstream decrease. He noted that he would remove the flood concern from the homes and structures but the properties would still be in a flood plain area.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if that is the properties that back up on Top View Drive. Mr. Fleming answered yes.

Mr. Fleming noted that the forth option was to remove the structures along Top View, take the homes out, grade the area of the homes flat over to the roadway at a three to one slope. He noted that we would be expanding the floodplain area where the homes currently exist today. He noted if we did that and did not do the project downstream, replacing the Earl Drive culvert it would achieve a one foot benefit in the 100-year storm elevation but the cost is significant. He noted that we would be taking three homes, doing extensive grading work as well as the culvert work, rehab work upstream and downstream. He noted that the cost is approximately \$850,000 when you look at acquisition costs and easements from other properties that would be necessary.

Mr. Fleming noted that replacing the Earl Drive culvert and expanding the channel, removing four structures upstream and grading the areas, if you combined the two projects, it could lower the flood elevation by two feet at a cost of \$1,640,000. He noted to maintain the existing Earl Drive culvert by replacing the bottom plates replace the Creek Drive culvert would

cost \$190,000 but you won't have a water surface elevation benefit for a 100-year storm. Ms. Lindsey noted that would be the water that the Top View Drive residents are getting. Mr. Fleming answered yes. He noted that the 2011 storm event was categorized as a greater than 100-year for a 1% chance rainfall and it took place during a high ground water period. He noted that it was a bad situation on top of a worst situation. He noted that looking at the 100 year flood occurrence and the frequency of it, for every storm you have you have a 1% chance of getting that storm again.

Mr. Fleming noted that all the properties that he looked at are currently impacted by a FEMA delineated floodplain and it requires flood insurance and the property owners are aware of the flood concern that impacts their property. He explained that the structures that are impacted, noting that one of the property owners is present this evening and he could confirm this, but he believes that there was only a couple of inches in the basement elevation that enter the structure and it does not impact the first floor. Mr. Hopple stated that he had over 5.5 feet in his basement. Mr. Fleming noted that at least one property was significantly impacted in the basement level.

Mr. Fleming noted that the Township policy is not to improve drainage that is on private property without Board approval. He noted that all the cost reviewed up to this point are planning level estimates. He noted that there are many private property impacted and that he has estimated the property values.

Mr. Robbins noted that he had nothing more to add.

Mr. Hawk noted that the basic rehab will not reduce the water surface level basin at all but isn't that the basic problem to begin with. Mr. Fleming noted that the structures function appropriately; the Earl Drive culvert passes the 100-year storm event and the Creek Drive culvert will be designed to pass the 50-year storm event. He noted that you will have more capacity in those structures than a lot of other structures throughout the Township. He noted that the result of the study indicated that the topography upstream and channel capacity is the significant contributor to the floodplain and the extent of its reach on those private properties. He noted if a proper channel had been installed in those areas, the structures may not have been impacted.

Mr. Hawk questioned if it could be moved easily without spilling over. Mr. Fleming noted if the channel was constructed so that it had greater depth available without the water coming out over the banks you could minimize the impact to those properties or if they would not had been constructed in the first place and that area was left to be a floodplain riparian area the structures would not be impacted. He noted that the culvert itself downstream has the capacity to convey the water that is getting to it.

Ms. Lindsey noted that Mr. Fleming stated that if the channels were constructed properly, so you are telling me that they weren't. Mr. Fleming noted if they would have been constructed in a manner to address that storm event, but understanding how areas are developed, it was likely viewed as a stream in the backyard area and as areas were built around it and other projects occur it pushes the floodplain around. He noted that basements are exposed and others are not, different construction techniques are used and you are left with what you have today.

Mr. Hawk noted that one does not reduce the water surface elevation but moves it more swiftly through the system, whereas the most expensive is to reduce the surface water elevation by two feet. He questioned if it also moves it swiftly or does it just result in a two-foot reduction. Mr. Fleming answered that it will move the water more efficiently through there and that is why you are experiencing a reduction in the water surface elevation. He noted that it is not stacking behind the culvert and the water won't have to wait for its chance to get through the culvert underneath Earl Drive. He noted that is why you don't have as much water upstream.

Mr. Hawk noted if you are going to solve the problem, solve it instead of putting a band aid on it, but then there is a price to be paid for it. Mr. Fleming noted that understanding that the flood depth was five feet in the basement and the maximum that his analysis that we can get is two feet there will continue to be a flood condition for that property of three feet.

Mr. Seeds questioned when was that area designated a FEMA flood plain, is that since 2011. Mr. Fleming noted that it was on the most recent maps. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it went back to the 1974 original maps that this area was designated. He noted that there was a floodplain designated in this area in 1974.

Ms. Lindsey questioned Mr. Hopple if he got water in his basement prior to 2011. Mr. Gerald Hopple, 1009 Top View Drive answered no. He noted that two weeks ago, we had 1.5

inches of rain and it flooded his property pretty good but it did not come up to the house. He noted that the backwash in that flood was terrible. He noted that you could see it circling around halfway up his property. He noted that the water at the culvert was up over the entrance and coming out the other side pretty good. He noted that there was nothing blocking it and he was very concerned about this.

Mr. Seeds questioned what causes the swirl. Mr. Hopple answered that it was the backwash as it can't all get through at one time. Mr. Fleming explained that you have water coming down the stream channel at a certain velocity and water stacking up in front of the culvert that doesn't have the same velocity so your water is starting to swirl and you also get a vortex at your culvert entrance from the water going through. Mr. Seeds noted that it is a normal thing when the pipe starts to fill up. Mr. Fleming noted that is what we anticipate in that type of condition.

Mr. Seeds noted that the proposal for \$1.6 million, if we would replace the pipe what size would it be. Mr. Fleming answered that it would be a box culvert and he analyzed a ten-foot wide box which is wider than the existing pipe with a height of about six feet. He noted that it would have a significantly greater capacity than the existing pipe. Mr. Seeds noted that it would impact the homes on both sides. Mr. Fleming noted that a choice would have to be made for which side you would offset the new structure. Mr. Seeds questioned if it would increase the volume tremendously. Mr. Fleming noted that the existing pipe passes the 100-year storm but he can't make a comparison that the old one would pass a 10-year storm and the new one a 100-year storm, but the capacity would increase based upon the larger structure that we felt that we could fit in there by only taking one property on one side or the other, and then grading the banks at a three to one slope.

Mr. Hopple noted that he has shown pictures to the Board in the past and some people came out and inspected his home. He noted that the pictures go back to where his neighbor, Mrs. Fry stands down at the edge of the creek watching the water come down through and maybe 20 feet from her was his tool shed surrounded by water, and it was even coming over to her property. He noted that it was that much of backwash coming up through there.

Ms. Lindsey noted that two weeks ago when Mr. Hopple had the last event, the neighbor's backyard didn't have any water. Mr. Hopple answered yes. He noted that over the years he has seen more of the embankment being washed out and it goes down into the Susquehanna basin and works its way to the Chesapeake Bay.

Ms. Lindsey questioned when you were flooded in 2011, were other resident's basements flooded. Mr. Hopple noted that the neighbor next to him that has a swimming pool was flooded and Mr. Heap's property had two feet in his basement, and the guy across from Dick Grable, his basement was flooded and other people got water.

Mr. Hopple noted since the roads went in above us, blocked off by the curbing, we have seen this water issue ever since. He noted that he wished that you would do something. He noted that removing homes, what it costs to remove a home, does the property owner get. Mr. Fleming noted that he does not look at a particular property value, he puts a total cost including things like demolition, property grading, acquisition cost, appraisals, and a assumed property cost in the area of \$200,000 for the home and added \$100,000 for associated costs per property. Mr. Hopple noted that he loves his home and he has been there all these years.

Mr. Hopple noted in regards to flood insurance, they did change the coding of the flood plain. He noted that after October of 2011, his insurance went from a low level to a high level and the insurances doesn't pay for anything in the basement. He noted that they pay for heating units, washer and dryer and hot water heater but nothing else. He noted that they will not pay for furniture, nothing. He noted that you put all that money into the flood insurance and they don't pay for anything making you turn the recreation room into a basement. He noted that he hopes the Board does something about this as it is very nerve racking and it is not getting any better. He noted if you put a bigger culvert at Creek Drive, more water will be coming down our way. He noted that we need to slow the water up and in his thick head he can't see what slows the water up from coming down there. He questioned how many more 100-year floods are possible in the next 20 years.

Mr. Fleming noted that he is working to design projects for next year and he is looking for direction for a rehabilitation project or considering something greater and what it should be.

He questioned if the Board needs more time to think about it. Mr. Hawk answered that he needs more time to think about it.

Mr. Crissman questioned at what point in time you need a decision in order to plan better. Mr. Fleming answered that construction projects for next year are currently under design so he will be setting design projects for next year for the 2016 construction season. He noted that he prepares a list for the design projects and constructs those projects the following year. He noted if you decided to move forward with the rehab project, it would go on the list for construction in 2016 and design in 2015. Mr. Crissman questioned if you need a decision this month. Mr. Wolfe answered it is needed for this budget cycle. He noted that he will put it on the road tour agenda.

Continued discussion regarding the Township's
Stormwater Management Ordinances

Mr. Wolfe noted that part of this discussion is in regards to the Township's interpretation of its regulations and Mr. Jeff Staub, Dauphin Engineering, would like to suggest that we may not be interpreting our regulations properly. He suggested that it would be good to let Mr. Staub speak first and go from there.

Mr. Jeff Staub, Dauphin Engineering, noted that what he found in regards to the Township's stormwater ordinance, the definition for impervious area or coverage that is different from the definition that is contained in the Dauphin County Act 167 Stormwater Management Plan. He noted that virtually all the other municipalities in Dauphin County, noting that he provided the list for the Board members, used the definition that is found in the Dauphin County Plan with the exception of East Hanover Township and the City of Harrisburg. He noted that those two municipalities, when they adopted their stormwater ordinance, adopted it prior to the adoption of the Dauphin County Plan. He noted that they did not have the benefit of knowing what the definition was at that time as the plan was not in existence.

Mr. Staub noted that it is a minor thing but for the Township to be current with the model ordinance he suggested that a relatively minor text amendment for the definition would be appropriate.

Mr. Crissman questioned what the difference between the two ordinances is. Mr. Staub answered that it is two sentences that are in the model ordinance definition that are not in the Lower Paxton definition. He noted that they both refer to exemptions to what impervious coverage is. He noted one example would be if a land owner would propose a deck or patio or driveway to be designed as an infiltration Best Management Practice (BMP), using pavers for example, that property owner would be given the benefit of not having to have the area counted toward impervious coverage for the lot. He noted that Dauphin County intended that they wrote it to encourage land owners to provide for pervious pavements and the like as opposed to not doing that.

Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Staub's proposal is to come into compliance with the Dauphin County plan, that our staff will review it and make a recommendation to follow suit or retain what we currently have. Mr. Wolfe noted that is what we are here to discuss this evening. Mr. Crissman questioned if we are prepared to agree to this. Mr. Wolfe suggested that Mr. Fleming has a response to this request.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Staub had something to say about the second definition. Mr. Staub noted that the second definition had to do with proposing stone or gravel on a new lot as part of the development that the current ordinance counts as impervious coverage. He noted that the Dauphin County Plan echoes it with a caveat of unless it is designed as a storm water BMP for infiltration. He noted that is what Bishop McDevitt High School did when they came back to the Township this year to ask for overflow parking. He noted that they were going to propose that some of the main drive for the overflow parking area to be stoned. He noted if it was to be designed as a stormwater BMP for infiltration then the stone would not be counted as impervious coverage.

Mr. Seeds noted under the existing language it would be but the County ordinance would consider certain area to be pervious not added to the total count. He noted that the limestone that comes from Central Pennsylvania is pervious to a degree, noting he has a stone area, and when it rains and you get a couple inches of rain, it does percolate to a certain point until it reaches a saturation point, then it will run off. He noted that he felt that there should be some credit given that if you have a 100 feet by 100 feet area of stone that there should be some credit for pervious.

He suggested that it should not be the same as blacktop or concrete surface. He noted that there is no deviation between the areas of stone and solid bituminous, noting that a stone area does percolate to some degree. He noted if we changed the language it would allow some consideration for debate on this issue.

Mr. Staub noted that some stone areas can be densely graded and compacted heavily, it is almost impervious, and so it works both way. He noted if you are going to have a parking area you could design it to be somewhat impervious.

Ms. Lindsey noted that Mr. Staub would like the Township to add the two sentences to the Township ordinance. Mr. Staub noted that he would like the language to be changed to the County ordinance. He noted that the Zoning Ordinance definition of impervious coverage and stormwater ordinance definitions are the same, so he assumed when the stormwater ordinance was written in 2010 it was looked at and to make the two definitions identical so there is no conflict. He suggested that is why the definition is different from the County definition.

Mr. Steve Fleming questioned, for consistency, what benefit it would be to the Township to add those two sentences to the definition. He noted that he would like to explain how he reviews stormwater applications. He noted that his colleagues all promote infiltration BMP in such a manner that if an applicant is proposing a impervious area and struggling to meet stormwater requirements, he will recommend that they consider pervious paving or concrete pavers, but he thinks that it is important to be involved in the recommendation because if they are not constructed properly, as you have been discussing, they can quickly become impervious. He noted if you don't use the correct material under the paver and don't use the correct material in between the paver and maintain pervious asphalts or concrete it will clog and become impervious in a short amount of time. He noted by not having those two sentences currently, the applications come to him for review, he makes sure that the proper details are on the plan and that they are constructed properly in the field and that you have the necessary maintenance procedures in place with the property owner to make sure that they maintain their pervious material.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Fleming is saying instead of making the two ordinances consistent we should enlarge it to provide enough background. Mr. Fleming answered that the

differences in the definitions only takes the applicant's ability to claim something as pervious and require to prove it. He noted that it is not onerous to do so and it does not require extensive engineering in those simple applications, and a parking lot plan may require some calculations, but if they want to expand a driveway, we will work with them so it is not an extensive process to go through the permitting process. He noted if they are going to use something that is supposed to be pervious he can verify quickly and efficiently that they will construct it properly in the field for inspection.

Mr. Hawk questioned if all of this is easily doable. Mr. Fleming answered that he has been successful.

Mr. Hawk noted that he understood Mr. Seeds' comments. Mr. Fleming noted that you have a potential for someone to come in each year and get a zoning permit for a project and say that the stone expansion in my parking lot is pervious and each year they do it and the next thing you know the entire lot is covered and they used the type of gravel that is impervious and you have no way to follow up on it.

Mr. Fleming noted that his recommendation would be to leave the definition as it is.

Mr. Seeds suggested that this discussion should happen on a County level as it looks like we are not the same as the rest of the County and yet our engineer is telling us that our definition is better. Mr. Crissman noted that we are getting very sound advice when you hear as to why that is. Mr. Fleming noted that it is the practical way for how we review our applications. He noted that it is applied across the municipalities that Mr. Staub referenced. He noted that his firm is the engineer in many of those municipalities and he can say that we apply those review procedures uniformly across those municipalities because they have similar ordinances. He noted that was the intent of the model ordinance, not that they would be exactly the same but everyone would be working on the same playing field.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Fleming did not have a problem as obviously HRG represents many townships and also the County. Mr. Fleming noted from an ordinance standpoint, they are not exactly the same but from a technical and application standpoint the enforcement is basically the same. He noted to the degree that he is protecting the Township and working with the property owners it is the same.

Mr. Stine suggested that one advantage that Mr. Fleming is referencing is that it require people to do a plan where otherwise they may not have had to do a plan. He noted if there is no plan done, then we don't know what they are doing. Mr. Fleming agreed with Mr. Stine.

Ms. Lindsey noted that by not including the decks and the parking areas it makes people have to go ahead and do stormwater when they may not need to. She noted that you are counting those as impervious coverage. Mr. Fleming noted that they would be required to complete an application but to the degree that they have to meet the requirements of the ordinance and would be dependent upon the project proposal. He noted if they feel at the onset that the project that they are doing in such a manner that certain calculations are required he would meet with them and help them through the process without going out and surveying. He noted if it is a smaller project and he is comfortable with it then... Ms. Lindsey suggested that much of this has to do with people installing swimming pools noting that decks are involved and how often does a swimming pool overflow. Mr. Fleming noted that a swimming pool is impervious and that is not in either one of these definitions, but if you go to how the ordinance is implied in all municipalities as well as going to the Maryland definition, which he forward, the Maryland definition specially calls swimming pools and ponds as impervious. Ms. Lindsey noted that they may not reach the 1,000 square foot requirement but they will reach it after you add on the deck or apron. She noted if the language was in the ordinance that states that it is not counted as impervious areas it might not have to go forward like that.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the language states that it is not counted as impervious area if it is a BMP. He noted that the best management practice means that the deck and gravel for the patio has to be installed in a pervious fashion. He noted at the same time, by our ordinance, you can do that now if you demonstrate that it is pervious. Mr. Fleming answered that is correct but you still have to apply for a permit but they don't have to do an additional stormwater BMP if that area is pervious. He noted that existing decks and existing impervious coverage are not counted, so in many cases the deck is already there. He noted that the swimming pool deck is counted. He noted that is the concrete area around the pool which can be anywhere from three foot outside the pool to a very large patio project.

Mr. Wolfe noted that we do not have any real good examples of pervious pavements in Lower Paxton Township being used. He noted that there are five driveways that were approved as pervious pavement on Patton Road but we had a problem with them in that they were not installed correctly and they have been problematic since they were built. He noted that it also requires special maintenance as they have to be vacuumed and can't be sealed. He noted that regular pavements can be sealed and don't have to be vacuumed and they function differently. He noted that he recalls how we came to this decision for the Township's definition. He noted we mirrored the zoning ordinance definition but we also don't believe that the residents understand that pervious pavement and pervious coverage is different in function than impervious and if you put one down and you don't know what you are doing, it doesn't work.

Ms. Lindsey questioned Mr. Fleming if he had an incident where if this would have been added it would have made a difference. Mr. Staub answered that is one of the reasons he started researching this issue. He noted that he had a client recently who had proposed a swimming pool and the associated deck area and landscaping and fencing. He noted if they were to use pervious pavers for the pool deck, and make that area a infiltration BMP, the land owner would not have had to gone to a stormwater management plan. He noted that he had to execute a maintenance operations agreement, post an improvement guarantee, and when finished the stormwater infiltration BMP had to be inspected and certified by the engineer with HRG inspecting it and having plans submitted to the Township for approval. He noted that it is a very long and complicated process and for the land owners, it is very expensive.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Staub is describing a process that is unbelievably complicated and in his mind very difficult for any residential property owner to navigate. He noted that it is very expensive. He noted that it is still there and problematic. He explained that he is adding this as an editorial comment, it is not something easy to enforce, but not easy to gain compliance with and when we deal with property owners they are not happy to have to do it.

Mr. Staub noted that you have to understand it from the property owner's perspective. He noted that his client felt as though they were being pick out. He noted that the regulations... Mr. Wolfe questioned Mr. Staub noting that you can forgo the maintenance agreement and the posting of the bond, but you can't forgo doing the plan because you have to do the BMP in

accordance with the specific design and you would have to do a plan. Mr. Staub answered what is interesting about the stormwater ordinance is if you proposed for less than 1,000 square feet you are exempt from doing all the things we talked about. He noted that was the issue with his client, he noted if they would have proposed a pervious deck area around the pool, their total impervious area that they were proposing would have been less than 1,000 square feet and they would not have had to do any of this. He noted that the weak link from the Township's perspective is that they are proposing an infiltration BMP to get them below the 1,000 square feet, how does the Township know that it is going to be engineered and designed and installed properly and maintained. Mr. Fleming noted that he would recommend that when a client comes to Mr. Staub if you see an opportunity for them to do something such as that, we have a pre-application which we have had in many instances which resulted in working through the process much more smoothly, noting that we can communicate that process directly to the property owner. He noted that we can discuss their project with them, what the means or ability is and in some instances that may offer other flexibilities. He noted if the project is constructed as per the plan, and his inspector can verify it when he is present, you don't need to do an as-built, and we don't have any issues with constructing those types of things. He noted those are the instances where we as professional advisors can consult with a client to help them through the process to make it less onerous.

Mr. Hawk suggested for the time being that we will leave the ordinance the way it is.

Ms. Lindsey questioned Mr. Fleming that going through the process, is that the only part that is pervious, is that the only one that is different from Dauphin County. She questioned if that is the only section. Mr. Fleming answered that he did not recall. He noted that he went through the model ordinance two or three times. Mr. Wolfe noted that we adopted two different amendments because of going through it how many times. He suggested that it may have been three or four times, doing at least two amendments. Mr. Stine noted that the one we did, we made the ordinance much clearer than it was because you couldn't tell if new impervious and additional impervious were treated the same when in fact they are not always the same. He noted an example of new impervious is where a house burned to the ground in the Township and the foundation had to be excavated, so the question becomes if they remove the old foundation,

and put another foundation in the same size is it new impervious according to the stormwater ordinance. He noted that staff's answer was that it should not be considered new so it was written into the ordinance that as long as it was within the original footprint it would not be considered new impervious and would not be subject to a stormwater management plan. He noted that is one instance where we cleared up an ambiguity.

Mr. Robbins suggested that we did that often when we went through the process since it was not always clear in our interpretation. He noted that it is a very difficult thing for the residents and staff but the one thing we have to do is to remember why we are doing this. He noted that Mr. Hopple's house that gets inundated with water is the reason why we are doing this. He noted that it is trying to prevent excess runoff from leaving properties. He noted that it is a difficult thing but it is very important. He noted if we make any changes we need to be sure that we are absolutely certain that what we are doing is for the best for the Township residents.

Mr. Fleming noted that the ordinance also speaks to the topography for the land as required in the stormwater permit and those types of things. He noted that the reason those things were written in there is if you are changing the way stormwater flows off of your property and you don't have an understanding of how stormwater works, you should consult with someone, whether or not the Township is requiring you or not. He noted that the Township is setting the threshold base on the County ordinance which is 1,000 square feet but he could provide cases that he has been involved in that are smaller projects than that and have caused problems for neighboring property owners. He noted that a blocked swale can cause flooding and it may not impact a structure but it can impact landscaping. He noted to those clients who are talking to Mr. Staub, maybe he can help them get underneath the ordinance requirement. He noted in talking to smaller project contractors they don't all have an equal understanding of stormwater and often times it is an afterthought and they are trying to do remedial measures when something doesn't go right.

Mr. Fleming noted that the ordinance does help the Township with stormwater management in these projects.

Ms. Lindsey questioned Mr. Fleming if he helped write the ordinance for Dauphin County. Mr. Fleming answered that he did not.

Mr. Staub noted that he appreciates the thought on working with him in regard to some of these projects that he is working on in proposing impervious coverage but we might be crossing the goal line without having to change the ordinance perhaps. He noted that it seems that there may be a way to work through some of the issues.

Mr. Robbins noted that he has had conversations with people and so has Mr. Miller, it is unbelievable what we have to do.

Mr. Hawk noted that we will leave it the way it is. Mr. Staub answered that he has a better understanding of how the process might work.

Ms. Lindsey noted if Mr. Staub can get some help from Mr. Fleming that would be good.

Review of the proposed footprint for the compost facility
under a Department of Environmental Protection general permit

Mr. Wolfe suggested that we table this agenda item and make it part of the next workshop meeting. He noted that Mr. Robbins is working with the Department of Environmental Protection on a revised permit another week will not impact what he is doing. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would like to have the plan before the Board so they can see it and although it is in the packet, waiting another month for a discussion will not be problematic. He suggested that the Board could do a road tour of the facility.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Lindsey seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved by,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

William L. Hornung
Township Secretary