

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop Meeting held April 13, 2010

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

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

Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steven Stine, Township Solicitor; Anthony Julian; Chief William Payne, Linglestown Fire Company; Eileen Hoover and Doug Kepler, Koons Memorial Park Swim Club; Cory Wolff, Bryce Hoch, and Tim Wolff, Energy Systems and Installations (ESI); Jeff Wendle, CET Engineering; Sam Robbins, Public Works Director; William Weaver, Sewer Authority Director; Chris Black, H. Edward Black and Associates, Ltd.; Daniel Schiavoni; and Watson Fisher and Ted Robertson, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Public Comment

No public comment was presented.

Request for support of PA HB1254, limiting the tethering of dogs

Mr. Anthony Julian explained that he was present to request the Board's support of Pennsylvania House Bill 1254, which would limit the tethering of dogs. He reported that the bill is in Committee at the State Capital and will be re-drafted prior to holding a vote. He noted that the main purpose of the bill is to tweak the amount of time within a 24-hour period that a dog can be chained as there are no current laws to address this issue. He noted that many dogs are chained outside 24 hours a day 365 days in a year, with little or no protective welfare. He noted, as long as a dog receives food, water, and shelter it falls within the current law's requirements. He noted that HB1254 would provide for more humane treatment of dogs, improve the living conditions for dogs, and increase the fines and penalties. In addition, it would provide additional

enforcement for cruelty instances that can be enforced by law enforcement and dog officers. He noted that it would change the amount of time that a dog can be tethered within a 24-hour period, a requirement that the tether must be swiveled on each end, the tether must be an appropriate size for the dog, tow chains and logging chains will not be permitted, and a harness or leather collar will be required. He noted that dog owners will no longer be permitted to use prong, metal or chain collars. He noted that the length of chain must be 12 feet in length, noting that there is no current regulation for this. He noted that a separate area for shelter must be provided, and the dogs must be free of open sores and wounds. He noted that dogs will not be permitted to be tethered outside if the weather is below 32 degrees or above 90 degrees.

Mr. Julian noted that the Humane Society reports that 60% of all nuisance calls concern dogs that are chained. He noted, in some instances, if a chained dog is freed from its chain, it could be a great harm to the community. He noted that continual chaining of a dog increases aggression, territorial dominance, isolation, and non-socialization. He noted that these dogs are prone to health issues and normally receive little or no veterinarian care. He noted that they are normally not neutered or spayed, and from 2000 to 2008 there were 104 deaths of dogs that were tethered. He noted from 1981 until 2010, there were 330 reported attacks. He noted that four more attacks occurred yesterday with dogs that were chained.

Mr. Julian noted that 13 states have an active tethering law, and eight additional states are in the process of enacting a law. He noted that the bill is coming up next week for a vote.

Mr. Hawk questioned how the new law would be enforced. Mr. Julian answered that it would broaden the cruelty laws so when a dog officer is dispatched to a reported situation, it would provide him the ability to search the area, and look for other dog cruelty issues as well. Mr. Hawk questioned if certain breeds of dogs are able to live outside all the time in kennels. Mr. Julian noted that it depends on the conditions. He noted that there are dogs that live in dog houses, but many are not appropriately insulated or maintained. He noted that some dogs can tolerate hot weather and others can tolerate cold weather. He noted that dogs are social pack animals and they should not be tethering by themselves with no human contact. He noted that the intent of the bill is to limit the amount of time a dog could be tethered in a 24-hour period as it is not good for a dog to be tethered all the time.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the bill is set to pass. Mr. Julian explained that the HB 1254 is coming up for a vote again. He noted that it would be redrafted on the Committee level. He

explained that the Humane Society will be present to make its case at that time, and that the Humane Society of the United States supports anti-tethering laws. Mr. Seeds questioned if the local Humane Society supports this bill. Mr. Julian answered that they are on a coalition list in support of it; however, it impacts them as they become the recipients of the badly treated dogs. Mr. Julian noted that his group, Canine Rescue of Central Pennsylvania, is involved with this issue and has had a hard time reprogramming the dogs to become adjusted to living inside. Mr. Seeds suggested that this new law would also put a burden on the Humane Society Officers. Mr. Julian noted that for the States that have passed similar legislation, there has been no extra burden placed on their shelters.

Mr. Seeds noted that this legislation would not permit a dog to be chained to a dog house. Mr. Julian answered not to a stationary object. Mr. Seeds questioned how this would affect a kennel that is not heated. Mr. Julian noted that this law has nothing to do with the kennels, as it is meant to target negligent dog owners. Mr. Seeds noted that after the temperature drops to a certain level in the winter, a dog would not be allowed to be outside. He questioned who would enforce this law. Mr. Blain suggested that the police would do this. Mr. Wolfe explained that a lost or stray dog would be taken to the Humane Society; a dangerous animal could be a police or Humane Society issue; a barking dog would be the responsibility of the police. He noted that he was not sure who would enforce an animal cruelty issue. Mr. Julian noted that the Humane Society would enforce that issue. He noted that there is a dog enforcement officer for Dauphin County. He explained, recently, he was involved in a case involving a dog in a pen, but he was unable to see if it was a bad situation, so he called the Humane Society and they confiscated the dog. He noted that there was no food or water for the dog and it was living in unsanitary conditions.

Mr. Seeds questioned if a person would be prohibited from having a dog chained outside after 10 p.m. Mr. Julian answered that this part of the bill is being redrafted. He suggested that there will be some type of restriction for keeping dogs tethered, noting that there will be certain hours that they can or cannot be tethered all year round, regardless of the temperature. He noted that the intent is to target irresponsible dog owners. Mr. Wolfe suggested that the Township does not receive many complaints about dogs that are tethered outside; however, the Township receives numerous complaints about barking dogs.

Mr. Seeds noted that in rural areas, many owners have hunting dogs and they are kept outside all year, noting that they have dog houses for those dogs. He noted that those people probably never bring those dogs in the house. Mr. Julian noted that they will be required to provide more suitable conditions for their dogs.

Mr. Hawk questioned who the prime sponsor was for the bill. Mr. Julian answered originally it was Representative Caltagirone, but currently it is Representative Casorio. Mr. Hawk questioned how the People for Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) are involved. Mr. Julian answered that they are not involved in this.

Mr. Hawk questioned in what form Mr. Julian wanted the Board's support. Mr. Julian answered that a letter of support to Representative Marsico's office would be great.

Mr. Seeds noted that he did not see anything in the House Bill requiring the heating of a dog house. He noted that hunting dogs are kept outside. Mr. Julian noted that the dog houses would have to be insulated or straw should be provided to protect the dogs in dog houses. He explained that he has taken in many chained dogs, and in some instances, the dog owners surrender the dogs to him since they don't want to pay the fees to the Humane Society. He noted that many of these dogs are not licensed. He explained that he just took possession of a seven year old greyhound dog that was chained for all its life that became pregnant. He noted that it was a very docile dog. Mr. Julian noted that there are very few laws to protect dogs.

Mr. Hawk explained to Mr. Julian that any action taken by the Board in support of this issue would have to be done during a business meeting, such as a letter of support to Representative Ronald Marsico.

Mr. Wolfe explained that Chief Payne had to leave for a structure fire and stated that he would try to get back to the meeting. Mr. Hornung noted that he would certainly want to support the Fire Company in a grant application. Mr. Wolfe suggested that Chief Payne wanted to explain the request to the Board members.

Review of the Key Indicator Report for year-end 2009

Mr. Wolfe explained that he would provide a brief synopsis for the Key Indicator Report for year-end 2009. He noted that he anticipates discussing the 1st Quarter Key Indicator Report for 2010 during the May workshop meeting. He noted that he was unable to have that report for this meeting since the March report has not been completed.

Mr. Wolfe noted that 2009 was a year that everyone would like to forget. He noted on page two of the Report, a general summary is shown for the General Fund, General Improvement Fund, Fire Equipment Capital Fund, Friendship Center Operating Fund, Lower Paxton Township Authority Operating Fund, and the Police and Non-Uniformed Employees Pension Funds.

Mr. Wolfe noted on page three, it shows that the Township was forced to significantly adjust its budget expenditures in 2009 to address the nation's recession. He noted that the Police Department's complement was reduced from 62 to 57, mostly due to attrition. In addition, the Township offered a retirement window, three employees took advantage of that window, and they were not replaced. He noted that Departments were prohibited from making non-essential expenditures and significant cost cutting measures were implemented. He noted that the 2010 budgets were prepared with the same assumptions in place.

Mr. Wolfe noted that 2009 bucked the trend for revenues and expenditures, with an average expenditure increase of 6% per year, and revenues increasing at 4%, however, this is not what occurred in 2009. He noted that page four shows the Township ended the 2009 year with General Fund Balance of \$5,302,832. He noted that this is greater than the Board's requirement of 25% of budgeted expenditures. He noted that \$1,273,680 was spent on capital expenditures in 2009.

Mr. Wolfe noted for the General Fund, the 2009 budget was \$19,153,859 for revenues and expenditures; however, the end result was revenues of \$16,899,846 and expenditures of \$18,693,433. He noted that spending was curtailed significantly to adjust to the economic recession. He noted that there was a deficit of \$1,793,589 in the General Fund, half of which was transferred to the General Improvement Fund for capital expenditures. He noted that the deficient for operations was \$858,589, and in almost all areas, the Township did not receive what was expected for revenues, due to the recession. He noted that 185 homes are built in the Township annually, however in 2009 only 45 homes were built, and there was no commercial development. He explained that there was no interest income since the interest rates for government approved investments were near zero. He noted that the Earned Income Tax (EIT) was 2% less than 2008, and the real estate tax distributions were comparable to 2008, but normally this would have increased. He noted that the Township was unable to adjust to the rapid loss of revenues.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the State Aid Fund, which is budgeted through the Pennsylvania Liquid Fuels Tax Act 655 of 1956 for the maintenance of the Township's transportation,

amounted to \$998,058. He explained that this fund experienced a surplus of \$56,570, which will be used in 2010. He noted that the Township received \$10,000 less in State Aid in 2009 from the previous year.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Fire Equipment Capital Fund balance at the end of 2009 was \$314,845. He noted that these funds will accumulate to fund Phase 4 of the Fire Equipment Capital Fund. He explained, when the Board authorizes the purchase of equipment it is for three pieces of apparatus, one for each Fire Company, and normally \$1.5 million is spent. He noted with a \$200,000 per year allocation, it will be some time before there would be enough funds to move to Phase Four. He noted that three pieces of equipment were purchase in 2007 and 2008.

Mr. Wolfe noted for the General Improvement Fund, the major expenditure was the completion of the Thomas B. George Jr. Park, including the improvement of the driveway at Nyes Road and the realignment of M Street. He noted, for the most part, Phases 1, 2, and 3 for the park are complete. He noted that other items are planned for the future. He noted that the Township's portion of the Village of Linglestown construction project is included in this fund. He noted that originally, the Township was the lead entity on the project; however, at the end of 2009 this was reassigned to PENNDOT for the construction phase of the project. He noted that the Township will reimburse PENNDOT as opposed to paying the bills, and seeking reimbursement from PENNDOT. He noted that the level of expenditure will decrease, but the overall result will remain the same. He noted that less was spent from the fund, and it was primarily due to the late start of the project. He noted that this fund included a revenue item of \$500,000 for reimbursement from the Commonwealth for recycling equipment purchased in the prior year, however, the Township did not receive the funds in 2009 and it is uncertain if the funds will be available in 2010.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Friendship Center Operating Fund include the journal entries for depreciation, showing a net loss of \$33,999, however, on a cash basis the Center was in the black. He noted that the end result was \$50,000 better than in 2008. He noted that many of the members switched from annual memberships to monthly memberships, and this affected the way the money came in. He noted that many retirees are eligible to have their memberships paid by their health care programs. He explained that staff made significant reductions in expenditures resulting in \$50,000 less than what was spent in 2008. He noted that the Friendship Center Capital Fund had a balance of \$320,582.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Sewer Authority had revenues of \$13 million and expenditures of \$24 million producing a deficit of \$11 million. This included starting certain PennVest projects in 2009 that would be paid in 2010. He noted that Mr. Weaver provided an explanation of the expenditures for the various projects that have been completed or are ongoing on page 27 of the Report.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the pension funds improved slightly in 2009 with the Police having an annualized return on investments of 16.2% and the Non-Uniform plan with an 18.7% return. He noted that this does not make up for the significant losses in the previous 18-month period. He noted that both plans lost roughly 30% in the prior years, and the plans have recuperated roughly 50% of those losses.

Mr. Hornung questioned why one plan realized a higher interest rate. Mr. Wolfe explained that both plans use the same money managers; however, they have different allocations. He noted that the Police pension plan receives more State Aid, but it also pays out higher pension benefits. Mr. Hawk noted that the pension funds are not badly funded. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township is considered a Level One Distressed Municipality, which is the least distressed level. He noted that roughly 80% of all municipal pension plans across the State are at some level of distress.

Mr. Hawk noted the decrease revenues forced the Township to put projects on hold. He noted that the citizens are used to a certain standard of living, and when it can't be provided, everyone gets upset.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he is starting to see some recovery in 2010. He noted for 2010, the total single-family building permits had revenues of \$150,000 as compared to \$30,000 in 2009. He noted that there is also a rebound in the sale of recyclables, noting that last year's rate was the base level of \$15 per ton for ten straight months; however, the current rate is \$50 a ton, which should generate roughly \$130,000 for the year. He suggested that things are not getting worse, but it may be a while before they return to where they were prior to 2008. Mr. Wolfe noted that he has a concern on what effect the expiration of the tax credit for first time home buyers will have on the building industry after the end of April.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Blain is responsible for the Key Indicator Report concept, and the Board has been creating the report for many years, as it has helped the Board to keep a eye on what impact the economy has on the Township's budget. He noted that staff was instructed to

take action early on to curtail some of its costs. He noted that this greatly helped the Township's financial picture, especially as it prepared its 2010 budget. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board moved to react to the economic situation in May of 2009, and continue to monitor it throughout the remainder of the year.

Discussion regarding sanitary sewer facilities for the Schiavoni Subdivision Plan

Mr. Weaver noted, as part of the overlay from the zoning ordinance adopted in 2006, CET Engineering was instructed to revise the Act 537 Plan, He noted that certain areas zoned as AR were designated as non-sewer areas, but under certain conditions the plan allows public sewer if it is in an overlay district which is a permitted use. He noted that Mr. Schiavoni's plan is a three lot subdivision that requires a approve planning module, but because of the AR District, it was important for him and CET to review the plan this evening as the Board would have to act on the planning module. He noted that the land was rezoned to AR and is a non-sewered area under the revised Act 537 Plan.

Mr. Weaver explained that Chris Black, H. Edward Black and Associates, Ltd. is present to discuss the plan. Mr. Black explained that Mr. Schiavoni intends to develop the property as his personal residence. He noted that it is a three lot subdivision, with the front lot remaining as Walter's Tractor Service. He noted that Mr. Schiavoni has cleaned up the front property and planted 85 trees this weekend. Mr. Crissman questioned if the commercial lot would be Lot C. Mr. Black answered yes, as it fronts on Linglestown Road.

Mr. Black explained that he requested relief from the Zoning Hearing Board for a flagship shaped lot, which was granted. He noted that two soil tests were completed, one by Mike Brown and the other by Mark Mills and neither provided an approved perk and probe test for an on-lot system. He noted that Mr. Schiavoni's intent is to develop the property for his own private residence, and is requesting to provide a private low-pressure force main at his expense. He noted that Mr. Schiavoni would enter into an agreement with the Township to maintain said system to the amount of 12,000 feet that would be placed in Linglestown Road to enter into a manhole located at Parkway East. He noted that Mr. Schiavoni is not looking to set precedent or to disturb the integrity of the AR District, only to build his residence, clean up an existing commercial property that currently uses a holding tank, and switch it to the low-pressure force main.

Mr. Hawk questioned if there were three lots, A, B, and C. Mr. Black answered that was correct. Mr. Black noted that Mr. Schiavoni's personal residence would be located on Lot A, his son would potentially occupy Lot B, with Lot C staying as it is, a commercial use. He noted, currently Lot B would be a buffer from Lot C until Lot B is developed.

Mr. Crissman noted that the letter from Mr. Shoaff references Lot 2 and Lot 3, and he questioned what the conversion would be for the plan in front of the Board. Mr. Weaver explained that the lots were configured differently at the time Mr. Shoaff wrote the letter. He noted that the lots were running north and south at that time; however, they have been configured to run east and west. He noted that the intent of the letter in regards to an on-lot disposal is still relevant in terms of what occurred for the testing. Mr. Black noted that it would still be relevant for the attempt to create an on-lot system for Lots A and B.

Mr. Black requested Board approval for the planning module to build a public low-pressure force main system to service the lots.

Mr. Seeds questioned if it would be a gravity system from north to south to Linglestown Road and then be pumped along Linglestown Road to the sewer system. Mr. Weaver noted that a grinder pump low-pressure force main would be installed on Lot A and run to Linglestown Road and then along Linglestown Road. Mr. Seeds questioned who would own the system. Mr. Weaver answered that the Township would own the system, but Mr. Schiavoni would enter into a maintenance agreement and an escrow account would be set up for the system. He noted that the Township would typically not own a force main on the applicant's property but since it would have a shared lateral from Lot B and C, Mr. Wendle recommended that the Township could still own the service since the owner would maintain it. He noted that the Ordinance does not allow shared laterals, except under a hardship condition. He noted that Mr. Schiavoni would have to provide an easement as well and a maintenance agreement for the force main to include the two shared laterals.

Mr. Seeds questioned if this has been done anywhere else in the Township. Mr. Weaver noted, in the past, the owner would provide a easement for the shared laterals so it would be recorded with the deed, but it is much cleaner to have the owner maintain the system and have the Township own the force main. Mr. Hornung questioned if the system would meet the Township's specifications. Mr. Weaver answered yes, noting that he would provide a comment

letter in reference to cleaning up the plan and for the planning module. He noted that there is nothing to prohibit the Sewer Department from recommending approval once the plan is revised.

Mr. Seeds questioned if this would be different from anything the Township has approved in the past. Mr. Weaver noted that the maintenance agreement would go for perpetuity. Mr. Crissman questioned if there are any problems or issues that a future Board would have to face if Lots A or B or sold. Mr. Weaver noted that was the reason for the Township owning the system and having the agreement in escrow. Mr. Crissman question if the Township is protected by this agreement. Mr. Wendle suggested that an appropriate agreement would have to be tied to the Lots since the Township is ultimately responsible for what happens to it. He noted that the agreement should state that the back lot would assume responsibility for the force main. Mr. Weaver questioned if it would be recorded as part of the deed. Mr. Stine answered that it would be recorded so anyone purchasing the property would have notice.

Mr. Wendle noted that it does not matter to him, but it is an AR zone, and he did not review the planning module because, if the Township makes an exception to the AR zone which is a non-sewered area, it would required a Act 537 Plan change. He noted that he could not review a planning module that would change the Act 537 Plan without the Board taking action. He noted that it would be an exception, and there is precedence in that it is not one of the overlays that the zoning permits it in, such as an open space or Traditional Neighborhood District (TND) overlay. Mr. Weaver noted that the intent for the AR zoning was to control the density, and Mr. Schiavoni's development would meet that intent.

Mr. Seeds questioned how often it occurs that such a large tract would not perk or probe. Mr. Weaver noted that this is new territory as there is no sewer in this area, so it would have to be pumped a distance or run along a gravity sewer. He noted for any overlay district in the AR zone, a developer is going to have a challenge to sewer it.

Mr. Hawk questioned Mr. Weaver if this is a reasonable approach for Mr. Schiavoni for a planning module. Mr. Weaver answered yes. He noted that the Department of Environmental Protection prefers public sewer and does not like on-lot systems when it is close to a sewer system. He noted that it appears that there is no other way to sewer the land. Mr. Seeds noted without this agreement, Mr. Schiavoni would not have any use for the property.

Mr. Hornung noted that typically, the Township does not allow flag shaped lots. Mr. Wolfe noted that flag shaped lots promote subdivisions along roads like Route 39 with multiple

points of driveways as opposed to constructing a single point of entry for a large subdivision. Mr. Hornung noted that Mr. Schiavoni should not expect more subdivision of this property from the Board at a future time. Mr. Schiavoni noted that he was very surprised that he could not find one portion of the land that would perk or probe for a septic system. He noted that he planted 85 trees this weekend and was told by the Zoning Hearing Board to clean up the front property. He noted that he has more work to do, but he expects to have it cleaned up by summertime.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the land has been tested for wells. Mr. Schiavoni noted that there are wells on the property and on the adjoining property.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Stine reviewed the request. Mr. Stine answered that he has only reviewed what was in the packet. Mr. Hornung noted that there will have to be an agreement for the common driveway. Mr. Stine noted that he would need an access easement that would provide for maintenance. Mr. Schiavoni noted that he would tie the guarantee to the first property, the business lot. Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Schiavoni if he would be in agreement to the sewer maintenance agreement. Mr. Schiavoni answered yes. Mr. Crissman noted that he would be supportive of the planning module as long as the maintenance agreement is included. Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Stine should review all the documents prior to bringing the plan to the Board.

Report from the Koons Memorial Park Swim Club on its 2009
operating season and plans for its 2010 operating season

Mr. Kepler explained that he provided a good report to the Parks and Recreation Board and they suggested that it be shared with the Board members. He noted that Eileen Hoover would make the presentation.

Ms. Hoover noted that the Swim Club has no unpaid bills at this time, and is current with its loan with Centric Bank. She noted that they have not missed any payments and at the present time there are 15 families who have taken out memberships for the 2010 season.

Ms. Hoover explained that she sent out mailers to all the previous members from the past three years, and then mailed a follow up mailer extending the discount period. She noted that she is hopeful that the warm weather will entice more people to take out memberships. She noted in 2009, most of the members join in May just before the pool opened.

Ms. Hoover noted that the pool will be open to the public free of charge on Memorial Day weekend. She noted that invitations will be made to the participants in the Memorial Day

Parade to swim free at the pool. She noted that this was done last year, and it resulted in many memberships. She noted that she had sent out 27 letters to various businesses soliciting sponsorships. She noted that signs will be placed in the pool area advertising the businesses who respond with a financial donation. She noted that she will follow up with a phone call to the businesses that were sent letters. She noted that the Swim Club will sponsor a sub sale in April and a yard sale on May 8th. She noted that the Swim Club received a \$500 donation from the Natalie Smith Foundation, and she thanked the Township for its help in securing that donation.

Ms. Hoover noted that two daycares have committed to use the pool during the summer and three additional daycares are considering the option.

Mr. Hawk questioned if there is a minimum number of membership for the pool to break even financially. Ms. Hoover answered that she had 60 memberships last year, and would need 80 memberships to break even. She noted that much of the financial support comes from walk-ins who pay the daily rate of \$8. She noted that the Swim Club is planning to rent the pool for \$150 for a picnic-type event. She explained that private parties can also be booked.

Ms. Hoover noted that the Swim Club did well considering it was \$11,000 in debt and experienced very rainy conditions last summer. She noted that the third-quarter payroll taxes were not paid on time. Mr. Blain questioned if the payroll taxes were paid. Ms. Hoover answered that the taxes were paid, but she filed the taxes with zero payment, and then paid a late penalty. Mr. Blain suggested that Ms. Hoover should be very cautious about that as the IRS considers non payment as tax theft.

Ms. Hoover explained that she anticipates a good swimming season, noting that the weather has already been warmer than last year. She noted that last summer provided for a very bad swim season and the pool closed early since no one came to swim. She noted that she has hired a more experienced person to manage the pool and an assistant manager to oversee the concession stand to control some of the losses that were experienced. She noted that two new board members have joined the Swim Club and one has much experience in managing pools and working with swim teams. She noted that the other person is someone who is very interested in helping the community.

Mr. Kepler explained that the weather was very bad last summer, and he hopes that more people will join this year. Ms. Hoover noted that there are no leaks in the pool, but the pump shed roof needs some repair.

Mr. Seeds questioned how much a membership costs. Ms. Hoover answered that a family membership, for up to eight persons (do not need to live in the same house) is \$285. She noted that many grandparents watch their grandchildren and this would allow them to bring them to the pool. She noted that there are single, couple, and senior citizen memberships as well. She noted that senior citizens and members of the Friendship Center received a 10% discount. Mr. Seeds suggested that something could be inserted in the Township's Newsletter concerning memberships for the pool. Mr. Wolfe noted that he could insert a paragraph in the newsletter if he receives the information by the end of the week.

Ms. Hoover noted that it is the 50th year of operation for the pool. Mr. Seeds suggested that they should enter a vehicle in the Memorial Day Parade to push the free use of the pool and memberships as well. Mr. Hawk noted that it seems that things are going well and there are many dedicated people working to make things happen.

Continued discussion regarding the proposed BC-1A
storm water system improvements

Mr. Sam Robbins explained that he wanted to provide an update for the BC-IA stormwater system improvements on Elmer Avenue in the area of Mr. Pinci's property. He noted that he plans to install a pipe across Linglestown Road and add a 24-inch pipe to run adjacent to the pipe that is currently in the road as part of the Linglestown Square Improvement project. He noted that the water would no longer run onto Mr. Pinci's property as it would run parallel to his property and be piped across the road. He noted that he is not adding stormwater, just providing a more direct route by piping it. He noted that he was in contact with Dauphin County this week and they will provide a letter requesting the Township to be the co-permittee. Once he receives the letter from Dauphin County, he will then make a formal submission to PENNDOT for approval, and then seek a cost estimate for the work from Wintermyer. He noted that once he receives the estimate, he would bring that to the Board to seek their approval. He noted that the contractor working in BC-1A will bring the pipe to Linglestown Road and then Wintermyer will do the work across the PENNDOT right-of-way.

Mr. Seeds questioned if this would put more water on Mr. Pinci's property. Mr. Weaver explained that the water currently comes out of the pipe and flows into a ditch Mr. Pinci's made.

Mr. Robbins noted if the water is piped, less water would be going into the ground and the percolation/infiltration would be very minimal.

Mr. Seeds questioned the advantage of doing this is and if it help the people on Elaine and Elmer Avenues. Mr. Weaver noted that stormwater is running from the street into the homeowners' back yards. He noted that it is the only place in the Township where the stormwater from another street flows into a resident's back yard. Mr. Seeds noted that this does occur elsewhere in the Township. Mr. Robbins noted that the water discharges behind Mr. Pinci's property and it is always wet due to the clear water system that is tied to it. He noted that a typical stormwater system is dry two days after it rains, but this area is never dry. Mr. Weaver noted that there are three houses directly involved in this issue. He noted that he is going to install a perforated pipe in the rear yard and it will allow the yards to drain better for the three residents on Elmer Avenue. He noted, as part of the public meeting for the sewer project, the people were really upset and wanted this drainage issue corrected. He noted that this will take the water out of the area and dry up their back yards. He noted that he would not complete the sanitary sewer work until June or July.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there would continue to be infiltration from the storm water if the water is not piped to Linglestown Road. Mr. Robbins noted that when Mr. Weaver tightens the sewer work up, and if there is more ground water, more water would be discharged via that clear water pipe. Mr. Wolfe noted, in the mid 1990's, when the Authority did the work in BC-1, it was the first area a clear water system was installed, and the pipe discharged into these three residents back yards. He noted that the intention was to replace the pipe and direct the water to Linglestown Road, however Mr. Pinci would not grant the Township the easement, and the Authority did not complete the project. He noted for the past 15 years the Township has been dumping clear water and sump pump water at this spot which is located in the rear yard of two homes and Mr. Pinci's property. Mr. Weaver noted that the pipe was further extended away from the homes.

Mr. Wolfe questioned Mr. Robbins was the estimated cost to fix this problem. Mr. Robbins answered that the cost to direct the water from the south side of Linglestown Road to the outfall on the north side is roughly \$60,000. He noted that Mr. Weaver estimates his costs to be around \$64,000 to take the storm water from Linglestown Road to the improvements in BC-1A. Mr. Seeds noted that it would cost \$120,000 to help those few homes. Mr. Weaver noted that

it is a 90-lot subdivision and would continue to take the storm water away from the development. Mr. Robbins noted that most of the storm water in the development has reached its useful life and needs to be replaced.

Mr. Seeds noted that there is still an issue with Eric Kessler's property. Mr. Robbins noted that he, Mr. Wolfe, and Mr. Case are meeting Thursday morning to further discuss that issue.

Mr. Weaver noted that he needs to meet with Mr. Pinci to get an easement from him to do this project. Mr. Hornung questioned if he would grant the easement. Mr. Weaver stated that it would take all the water away from his property. Mr. Weaver noted that he hopes to get some credit for his \$64,000, as he plans to build an outfall structure, therefore the costs would be more in the area of \$46,000. Mr. Robbins noted that bringing the pipe across Linglestown Road drives the cost up a little as he must use reinforced concrete pipe, (RCP) instead of HDP which is a plastic pipe. He noted that HDP can be installed in the right-of-way but not in the road. Mr. Hornung questioned how deep a project this would be. Mr. Robbins answered that it is four to five feet deep.

Mr. Seeds noted that he did not think the Board was aware that Mr. Kessler claims that the Township has created a wetland issue for his land since the change of the pipes in that location. He noted if this is not resolved it could be litigated. Mr. Weaver noted that he is shocked that the residents off of Elmer Avenue have not taken legal action against the Township. He noted that the situation with Mr. Kessler is totally different. He noted that the water is going into a controlled structure, but what the Authority is planning to do would add more surface water to people's back yards. Mr. Robbins noted that the pipe that Wintermyer installed is sunk and when any water comes out of that pipe, it appears as though the pipe is running half full. Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Robbins would have to sell Mr. Kessler on that. Mr. Weaver noted that the water is leaving the same place the Township is piping from, and it will end up in the same area. Mr. Seeds suggested that there will be more surface water from Linglestown Road once the improvements are made. Mr. Robbins noted that according to the storm water report, that is not supposed to happen. Mr. Weaver questioned, since it is located at the end of Mr. Kessler's property, if the water drains into a perennial stream. Mr. Robbins noted that there is a perennial stream that drains the water. Mr. Robbins noted that he walked Mr. Kessler's meadow, and he did not find any evidence that there is more water now, noting that the area has been wet for a

long time and will continue to be wet for a long time. Mr. Seeds noted that he did not disagree with Mr. Robbins. Mr. Robbins noted that he would like to meet with Mr. Kessler in the near future.

Continued discussion regarding proposed improvements to
the streets in the Huntfield development

Mr. Robbins noted that he wanted to discuss street improvements for the Huntfield Development that is located in the southeastern corner of the Township off of Willoughby Road. He noted that Huntsman Drive comes off of Willoughby Road, and that the roadway was built in the 1990's and has never been resurfaced. He noted that it serves roughly 38 homes and the road length is 2,800 feet. He noted that the roadway is 34 feet wide and it has two three-foot paved shoulders. He noted that the pavement section was made up of six inches of number four stone, an inch of binder, and 1.5 inch of wearing course. He noted that the road has held up pretty good.

Mr. Robbins noted that the roads are unraveling, and weathering as there is no material to hold the road together. He noted that some sections will need base and shoulder repairs. He proceeded to show various pictures of the needed repairs. He explained that for Huntsman Drive from the lower end, he hope to cover the cracks with the fabric material. He noted in some sections the road is almost 40 feet in width. He noted that his Department has made marks on the road noting where the base repair is needed, and it is needed for roughly 15% of the road project. He noted that the lower section of the cul-de-sac will have to be replaced as it has completely unraveled. He noted in other areas more base repair is needed. He noted that there are not many utilities or storm water in this development; however, there are a couple of pipes that will need to be replaced. He noted that there is a concaved section in the middle of the roadway that needs to be replaced, as it holds water. Mr. Seeds questioned why the road is failing. Mr. Robbins answered that the road does not have a sufficient crown, and the water can't flow off the roadway and in some areas, the water lies along the edge of the road and then seeps under the base.

Mr. Robbins noted that he took a picture of a Waste Management Recycle Truck parked along the side of the road, and it shows that the current road is so wide, that two cars can still pass with the truck in the cartway.

Mr. Robbins noted that there are several options for repairing the shoulders, noting that a natural swale exists next to the shoulders to capture the water and move it out of the area. He

noted that the shoulder is unraveling, and cracking. He noted, when the water does not run off the roadway, it works its way into the pavement and will continue to damage it. He noted that drainage, base repair, street width, and how the road should be paved are the issues that need to be reviewed. He noted that paving the entire development is a money issue, suggesting that it should be done in two phases. He noted that option one would be to overlay the current pavement from edge of pavement to edge of pavement. He noted that the people in the community do not want their streets to be narrowed. He explained that the Liquid Fuels Allotment is based upon linear feet and not width. He noted to overlay the current pavement with road and shoulder repair, along with base repair using geo-textile fabric, and a wearing course from edge to edge would cost roughly \$400,000.

Mr. Robbins noted that option two would be very similar but it would remove the three foot shoulders replacing it with topsoil which would have more costs upfront, but in the long run, it would result in paving a narrower section of roadway. He noted that this option would cost \$320,000; however, the additional topsoil and seeding are not included in that cost. Mr. Seeds questioned if the pricing was for in-house work or to have it contracted out. Mr. Robbins recommended contracting all the work except for the base repair. He suggested that the Township could deduct \$35,000 from the scenario if the base repair was done by Township staff. He noted that the road is not overly used and he could do much of the base repair in one day. He explained that he would not want to do the excavation of the shoulders.

Mr. Robbins displayed pictures of the base repair work completed on Briarsdale Road. He noted that sufficient material was installed to reestablish the crown in the road for a 1% to 2% level which forces the water to the curb and into the gutters. He noted that he used True Pave on Briarsdale Road, but he would probably not use it in the Huntfield Development. He noted that there is a lot of heavy truck traffic on Briarsdale Road, and they tacked the road first and then installed the geo-textile fabric and added the True Pave on top of it. He noted that Handwerk and Hempt Brothers did not like using the geo-textile fabric as the material got stuck in the paver; however, he discovered that they were not skilled at how to install the fabric. He noted that a company from Allentown installed the geo-textile fabric on Briarsdale Road and it worked out very well. He noted that the tack helps the material to adhere to the roadway and the hot bituminous knits the two together as the fabric creates a layer to protect the longitudinal cracking so it does not come back through the pavement.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board needs to determine what the pavement width should be for this development. He noted that both options would be somewhat similar except for taking out three feet of shoulder for both sides of the road. He noted that it would also impact driveways and mailboxes, and all the mailboxes are ornamental bricked structures. He noted that there would be an outcry from the residents if the road was shortened. He noted that the residents are used to one thing, and they don't want it changed.

Mr. Seeds questioned if this was one of the worst roads in the Township at this time. Mr. Robbins answered no. Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Robbins had a list of the roads in bad condition. Mr. Robbins answered yes. Mr. Seeds noted that every year the Board cuts the pavement management program due to budget shortfalls and every year more roads are deteriorating, and he questioned if it would be good to prioritize the roads and float a bond to get the roads repaired at a good bid price. He noted that roads are getting worse and the Township does not have the funds to keep up with the needed repairs. He noted that the Township is fixing the sewer system, storm water system, and the next thing should be the infrastructure for roads.

Mr. Robbins explained that a pavement management system would assign a numerical value to each street, and the Board would have the luxury to decide that any road below a certain number would not be repaired at this time. He noted that this information would be accessible when a homeowner calls to complain about his or her street. He noted that the roads will not fix themselves, and it is an overwhelming task to drive the Township to discern what roads are in the worst shape.

Mr. Robbins noted that he would like to do the base repair for the Huntsman Development this year. He stated that he would like to use the paving money to repair other roads that are in worse shape and more heavily used. He noted that Miller and Devonshire Roads are in bad shape and much more heavily used. He noted that one leg of the development could be done next year and then finished the year after. Mr. Seeds suggested that Mr. Robbins and Mr. Wolfe come up with a plan for paving using the funds available for paving. Mr. Robbins noted that a section of Devonshire Heights Road needs to be repaired, Miller Road from Fritchey Street to Route 22, a section of Houcks Road by Muscalus Furs, a short section of Prince Street near Route 22, and Devonshire Road's drainage and street from Route 22 to Hampton Court. He noted that he would target these streets this year. Mr. Seeds questioned if there was money in the

budget. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mr. Hawk noted if the base repair was done this year, it would show the citizens that some work is being done at this time.

Mr. Robbins suggested that he could sell the narrowing of the roadway to the residents if they narrowed the area from one mailbox to the next property. He noted that he would not have to extend or replace a large amount of driveways or mailboxes, but he would have to address the concrete driveway aprons. He noted that he would like to draft a letter to the residents or schedule a public meeting to explain what work would be done. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would need to have a public meeting with the residents to explain the work. Mr. Hawk suggested that the base repair could be done now, and then a public meeting could be held with the residents to go over the rest of the project.

Mr. Blain suggested that Mr. Wolfe should contact Ken Shutz, the president of the Home Association, and let him know what is planned and he could determine if a neighborhood meeting should be held. Mr. Hornung noted that a resident came into his workplace and screamed at him about the fact that the plan was to reduce the road cartway. He suggested that curving back to the driveways and mailboxes may solve the problem. Mr. Robbins noted that he could explain it at a public meeting and he feels that most of the people would be okay with it.

Presentation by the Linglestown Fire Company on its intent to file a Local Share Grant application before the Dauphin County Commissioners

Mr. Hawk explained to Chief William Payne that the Board was in support of Linglestown grant application. Mr. Crissman questioned Chief Payne if he wanted to share anything with the Board members. Chief Payne explained that the Fire Company is trying its best not to have to borrow any money to complete projects. He noted in 2009; his people spent 4,000 hours for fundraising. He noted that this is getting much more difficult to do. He noted that he is now trying to use the Gaming Grant as an avenue to raise funds, however, he needs to go through someone to get on the list. Mr. Wolfe explained that the Fire Company can not go through the Township to apply. Chief Payne questioned if the Board members would support his going directly to the Dauphin County Commissioners. Mr. Wolfe noted that he is not quite sure how the process works, but he noted if Chief Payne can get the support of East Hanover Township or a municipality that abuts East Hanover Township, then he could qualify. He suggested that Dauphin County can also submit on behalf of any municipality in the County.

Chief Payne noted that as long as the Township agrees to support the Fire Company, then he could apply for a grant through Dauphin County on behalf of the Township. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would depend on who is explaining the process. Chief Payne noted that he has a meeting at West Hanover Township on May 13th, to meet with their Board of Supervisors. He noted that he is hoping that they will support the Fire Company in the grant process. Mr. Wolfe noted if West Hanover Township will support the Fire Company, he would help him complete the application process.

Mr. Crissman questioned Chief Payne if he had what he needed to keep the action moving forward. Chief Payne answered yes.

Mr. Hornung questioned how much money the Fire Company raised using the 4,000 man hours. Chief Payne answered that the Fire Company spent 4,446 hours in 2009 for fundraising and it made roughly \$15,000. He noted that he does not count the mailer that he sent out to the local residents soliciting donations. He noted that another \$30,000 was raised from the fire company mailers. He noted that he has proof that once the casino opened in Grantville, they lost the revenues from their Bingo games. He noted that people stopped coming and instead went to the Casino in Grantville and that took \$25,000 to \$30,000 as a source of revenue away from the Fire Company. He noted that they tried to run the Bingo games for three months and lost \$2,500. Mr. Wolfe suggested that that would be the biggest card to play in the application. Mr. Seeds questioned when the Fire Company quit the Bingo games. Chief Payne answered after the first of the year. Mr. Seeds questioned if other fire companies lost revenues in their Bingo games. Chief Payne answered that he did not know of any other fire companies that ran Bingo games.

Continued discussion with CET and ESI regarding the proposed development of a solar farm on the Township's closed municipal landfill

Mr. Wendle explained that his memo to the Board was written to provide an update for what was going on. He noted that Corey and Tim Wolff and Bryce Hoch from Energy Systems Installations (ESI) are present to update the Board on what is going on. He suggested that he has a good handle on what the projected costs will be, and that there is a projection for more energy credits than what was originally projected. He explained that he met with Mr. Robbins to come up with a better location for the solar panels, as the Compost Facility has moved further from the

homes to create more of a buffer. He explained that Mr. Hoch designed a new layout for the solar field and he, along with Coery and Tim Wolff are present to update the Board.

Corey Wolff distributed notes for his power point presentation. Mr. Wolfe explained that the power point presentation has some issues since it is not displayed in Microsoft.

Corey Wolff explained that a site visit to a Bucks County solar farm has been set for Monday, April 19.

Corey Wolff noted that the original plan called for a 3 megawatt system, but it has been reduced to 2.95 megawatt solar photovoltaic array, and will be placed on 15 acres at the landfill to offset the Township's usage at the Swatara Township Waste Water Treatment Facility (STWWTF).

Corey Wolff estimated the interconnection costs with PPL to be approximately \$510,000, and based on the reduction in size of the solar array and site, the total price for this array would be \$15,600,000. He noted that due to issues at the Compost Facility, the original design was changed to accommodate the use of different areas of the landfill. He noted that PPL has emailed him that the costs for the interconnection are a very good estimate. He suggested that the price may be less, and he is working with PPL and the Public Utility Commission (PUC) to obtain clarification for any fees imposed on Lower Paxton Township or the STWWTF for net metering. He noted that net metering is the Commonwealth's legislation that allows the Township to offset the power use of one location for generation at the second location within two miles. He noted that the Township currently pays seven cents for generation at the STWWTF. He noted that he is meeting with the PUC on Thursday to receive clarification on this matter, especially since the two entities are not owned by the same municipality. Mr. Wolfe noted that the STWWTF is an Authority of which the Township is a member. Corey Wolff noted that he is meeting with Scott Gephart from the PUC, who happens to be a Lower Paxton Township resident. He noted that it is a new field and the PUC is working through many issues, and he is also attempting to clarify some interpretation issues. He noted that the Township is only paying seven cents for generation, whereas, many others are paying ten to twelve cents for power.

Corey Wolfe noted that the operational insurance quote for the Township for physical damage is \$17,000 annually. He noted to add general liability would be an additional \$5,000 and to add an umbrella for \$1 million, it would cost an additional \$5,000 or for \$5 million, it would cost an additional \$7,500.

Corey Wolfe noted that it was originally discussed to use CREBs which are renewal energy bonds with zero interest money, however that money was allocated and although there is talk about reallocation of these funds, since there is some uncertainty, he suggested that the Township look into the Build America Bonds (BAB) providing a 4% interest rate.

Corey Wolfe explained that he has talked about Renewable Energy Credits (RECs) in the past and this is the main financing mechanism for the project. He provided some links for the Board members to review for more information on the RECs, especially the current rates. He noted that Pennsylvania has an alternative portfolio standard and he provided it as a handout to the Board members.

Corey Wolfe explained that he has supplied two scenarios for a cash flow analysis, the first using \$250 REC and \$.07 per KWh, and the second using \$290 REC and \$.10 KWh. He noted that the current market is \$280 to \$300 for RECs.

Corey Wolfe noted for the first scenario, with \$250 REC at \$.07 income per kilowatt, the SRECs produced would be 3,965 megawatt hours per year that translates to \$1.1 million in the SREC sales. He noted that the power generation at \$.07 is \$277,550, with a gross income of \$1.2 million, with roughly \$40,000 in expenses; and for a \$12.6 million BAB at 4%, the debt service would be roughly \$927,130, producing a cash flow of \$303,395. He noted that the loss of production from the solar panels over a 25-year period would be roughly \$23,000, and this would provide for the debt to be paid off in less than nine years. He noted that page five portrays the second scenario with the RECs at \$290 using the power generation at \$.10 per KWh, noting that year one generates \$580,000, with the expenses remaining relatively the same.

Corey Wolfe noted that the modules are rates for eight tenths of one percent loss per year. Mr. Hoch noted that this is the guaranteed performance; typically it is more like half a percent per year.

Mr. Wendle noted that the yearly operating cost estimate of \$40,000 includes \$17,000 for insurance, grounds keeping, and commissions to be paid for RECs. He noted, when asked what other maintenance there would be, he was told that it would include the replacement of the power inverters in ten years. Mr. Hoch advised that the Township could purchase an extended warranty for the power inverters for 20 years.

Corey Wolff explained when the Township trades a REC, there is typically a commission associated with it. He noted that the Township would probably enter into a direct contract with a

utility which would require no commission fees. He noted for the life of the project over 25 to 30 years, it would result in a savings of \$400,000. He noted for many of the utility companies, their rate caps have not come off yet, so the REC market has been somewhat chaotic. Tim Wolfe note that between 50% and 60% of Pennsylvania's electricity is still under rate caps, so those utilities are not required to buy these. He noted once they are required to purchase the RECs then the supply and demand market will move into full force.

Corey Wolff noted that he is attempting to define the net metering issue between two different locations and what the value would be. He questioned if there was a direct energy contract. Mr. Wendle noted that the STWWTF has a contract with Direct Energy to purchase power. Corey Wolff noted that he must discuss the terms of the contract, noting that the Authority could not get more than what is provided for in the contract, so it should be mirrored as the worst case scenario. He noted that he would be provided with more clarification on this after he meets with the PUC.

Corey Wolff explained that he is meeting with DEP and the Township on Friday to discuss the ground screw penetration; as they must ensure that the screws do not penetrate something that it shouldn't.

Corey Wolff noted that he has a site visit schedule to the largest system in the State in Buck County, and the top five site east of the Mississippi. Mr. Seeds questioned if the Board members are going. Mr. Wolfe answered if the Board members are available they are invited to go along on the tour. Tim Wolff noted that the tour will begin at 2 p.m. at the Bucks County facility. He suggested that he would allow 45 minutes for the tour and the Board members should be back around 5 p.m. Corey Wolff noted that it was very hard to schedule this meeting.

Corey Wolff noted that the next phase for the project would be to develop a request for proposals. Mr. Seeds suggested that applying for a permit from DEP could take some time. Mr. Wendle noted that fill would be added to the area.

Mr. Seeds noted that the project would use up the entire flat area of the landfill, and the Township would not be able to do anything else with that area. Mr. Wolfe noted that he has to provide a 300 foot buffer area between the active compost facility and a residential structure. He noted that is why Mr. Robbins has been moving the compost area more to the west. Mr. Seeds questioned if the area of use has been enlarged. Mr. Hoch answered that he made a decision to install more racking and panels, noting that it would be more beneficial to the Township. He

noted that the first design used a smaller area, but the last design shows the same amount of racking and panels. Mr. Wendle noted that between both meetings, the costs of the solar panels decreased, and it was found to be more economical to switch to the fixed panels in place of the tracking panels. Mr. Hoch explained that the tracking panels have actuators that run gears and motors, that were designed to work in desert areas, but in this area of the country where there could be ice issues he decided to eliminate them. He noted that the panels will be fixed with zero moving parts. Mr. Seeds questioned if the proposed system would become obsolete. Mr. Hoch noted that it would become obsolete, but it will function and serve its purpose. He noted that the plan is designed to create a certain amount of power and it will still do that. He noted that the technology will change, noting that NASA has developed silicone crystals that the industry would not see for a few years, and eventually it will take a smaller area to create the same amount of power.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the Township would receive any complaints from the residents. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township would probably receive some complaints. He noted that this will have no smell, noise, or sound. Mr. Seeds questioned if the people in the area are expecting a park. Mr. Wolfe answered that he did not know how a park could be built in that location, noting that the surface is not stable. Mr. Seeds questioned how it could be stable for a solar array. Mr. Wolfe noted that the panels will screw into the ground, and if a panel moves, you unscrew it, level it and put it back in place. Mr. Seeds suggested that you could do that with playground equipment. Mr. Wolfe noted that the tennis court is sinking, the basketball court is uneven, and the pavilion is cockeyed. Mr. Wendle noted that when the array was relocated, a big part was located in the area of differential settling, noting that there were big holes that were filled and are still settling. He noted that the array is now located in some native areas, and in areas that are uniformed. He noted if the panels sink uniformly, it would not make much of a difference. Mr. Robbins questioned where the inverters would be installed. Mr. Wendle answered that there are areas along the road where it could be installed on native soil. He noted that he would not want to place the inverters in the fill area. He noted that more discussion needs to be held as to where the most efficient location would be to place them. He noted that they are 36 feet long and 11 feet wide and are placed on piers. He noted that three inverters would be installed.

Mr. Seeds noted if the Township took out a 20-year bond, it could experience revenues of \$300,000 each year. Corey Wolff noted the funds could be kept to be used in the General Fund

or it could be used to pay down the debt. Mr. Seeds questioned if the Township would have to pay a tax or PUC fee. Mr. Stine noted that the Second Class Code authorizes the Township to generate electricity.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the dust from the Compost Facility would have an impact on the solar panels. Mr. Hoch answered no, as the area receives enough precipitation to take care of that issue. He noted that Lancaster County is not a good location due to the limestone quarries and the particles, which when they become wet create a cement affect. Cory Wolff noted that the loss of efficiency is calculated for these types of instances to include cloudy days. Mr. Hornung questioned if the panels could be hosed off. Mr. Hoch answered that they can be hosed off.

Mr. Hornung questioned if, initially, there was a problem with corrosion on the connectors. Mr. Hoch answered that this problem was solved by using a new kind of junction boxes, noting that he would be using low-profile sealed plastic boxes. He noted that he contracts with TYCO for the parts. Mr. Hornung questioned if there could be a break in a connection and loss an array of panels. Mr. Hoch answered no. He noted that the equipment is monitored 24 hours a day, seven days a week. He noted that they would receive an email informing them that they need to check a certain string of panels. He noted that the monitoring equipment shows each individual string circuit of 13 panels. He noted if one module would be taken out he could identify which one was taken out. He noted that he keeps spare panels for the purpose of making repairs. He noted that the site would be fenced, and the insurance policy would cover acts of vandalism. Mr. Seeds questioned if snow, ice, or bird droppings would impact the panels. Mr. Hoch noted that it would not have an impact on the panels. Mr. Crissman questioned what the turnaround time would be to make repairs. Mr. Hoch noted that he keeps spares of the modules in the warehouse. He noted that it would be an immediate turnaround. Tim Wolff noted that the insurance policy includes loss of production and income. Mr. Hornung questioned what would happen if lightning hit a panel. Mr. Hoch answered that every circuit has lightning overprotection, however, he could not state that a panel could not be hit by lightning, noting that lightning protection does fail, but again it would be covered by the insurance policy. He noted that each individual module has grounding lugs to the racking and each stanchion of the racking has to have ground footings that are driven directly into the ground. Mr. Robbins questioned who does the maintenance. Mr. Hoch answered that there is virtually zero maintenance for the equipment. He noted that since everything is monitored 24 hours a day, he can determine if there

is a loss of voltage, identify the panel and make the necessary repairs. Tim Wolff noted that he would provide the first five years of monitoring free of charge. Mr. Hoch noted if a failure would occur, it normally happens immediately, but mainly in the first few months. Tim Wolff noted that the most common reason for failure is poor installation.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would be leaving around 11 a.m. from the Municipal Center to go to ESI to go with them to tour the site. Mr. Seeds noted that he would have to be back by 6 p.m. Corey Wolff noted that he would recommend taking pictures. Bryce Hoch noted that once the solar panels are in place at the landfill, many people will want to tour the facility. He noted that some facilities provide educational tours, especially for school trips.

“Otta Know” Presentation: (no items scheduled)

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Blain made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman
Township Secretary