

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop Meeting held December 14, 2010

A workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6:01 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 David B. Blain.

Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steven Stine, Township Solicitor; Stephen Fleming, Township Engineer, HRG, Inc.; Brian Luetchford, Parks and Recreation Director; David Johnson, Public Safety Director; Forrest Troutman, Cider Press Associates, LLC; Brian Engle, RETTEW Associates, Inc.; and Watson Fisher, and Ted Robertson, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Public Comment

No public comment was provided.

Continued discussion regarding proposed 2011 fiscal year budgets

Mr. Wolfe explained that he prepared the standard resolution for adoption of the 2011 budget for the December 21st meeting. He noted that it provides for a General Fund (GF) balance of revenues and expenditures of \$18,165,600; State Liquid Fuels funds, revenues and expenditures of \$980,440; General Improvement Fund (GIF), revenues and expenditures of \$1,519,500; Friendship Center (FC) Operating Fund with revenues of \$2,096,990 and expenditures of \$2,116,344; and FC Capital Fund with revenues of \$115,000 and expenditures of \$262,950. He noted that the real estate tax is being levied on all property in the Township at the

rates of .6815 mills for general purposes, .240 mills for fire protection, and .41 mills for library funding, for a total of .9625 mills.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the 2010 year-end estimate for the GF is to have revenues of \$17,878,004 against expenditures of \$17,655,732, producing a balance of \$222,272. He noted that this includes a GF transfer of \$690,842 to the GIF. He noted that State Aid has revenues of \$980,621 with expenditures of \$1,057,297 using \$76,676 of prior year's revenues. He noted that the GIF for capital projects is \$1,231,042 with a transfer of \$690,842 from the GF.

Mr. Wolfe noted the FC Operating Fund has revenues of \$2,003,630 against expenditures of \$2,326,042 producing a deficit of \$322,412, which includes \$249,000 in depreciation, producing a deficit of \$73,412 which is made up from the fund balance.

Mr. Wolfe explained that the board adopted the Lower Paxton Township Authority Operating Fund and Capital Fund budgets during the November 23, 2010 Authority meeting.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the expected fund balance for the GF at the end of 2010 is \$4,834,262.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the General Fund for 2011 will be balanced at \$18,165,600 with a GF transfer of \$831,800 to the GIF. He noted that State Aid is balanced at \$980,440. He explained that the GIF is balanced at \$1,519,500 to include the \$831,800 transfer from the GF.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the FC Operating Fund has revenues of \$2,096,990 against expenditures of \$2,125,444 producing a deficit of \$19,354.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Lower Paxton Township Authority Operating and Capital Funds were adopted during the November 23, 2010 Authority meeting.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the GF balance at the end of 2011 is expected to be \$4,262,262. He explained that Board policy is that it must meet the 25% threshold of operating funds, which is \$4,541,400; however, this will not occur if the budget is adopted as it currently stands. He noted that the Board has committed to return to the 25% threshold within two years.

Mr. Wolfe noted that all spending is restricted to only what is absolutely necessary and the new budget will include a 10% tax increase. He noted that \$179,710 was realized in savings due to the 2010 bond refunding that will be realized in 2011 only. He noted that the miscellaneous expenses of unallocated revenues are \$12,319.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the 2011 GIF expenditures are as follows: Pavement Management System, \$75,000; Financial Management System, \$100,000; Koons/Wolfersberger planning, \$80,000, half of which is paid by a grant; stormwater projects, \$350,000; Village of Linglestown project, \$800,000; road and traffic signal improvements, \$99,500; and Compost Facility Berm, \$15,000.

Mr. Wolfe noted that 2011 FC budget has a deficit of \$19,354 and an FC Operating Fund balance of \$190,155, noting no increase in membership fees for 2011, and expenditures of \$115,000 from the Capital Fund for energy improvements. He noted that another \$115,000 was received in grant funds from the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) for a total project of \$230,000. Mr. Luetchford explained that the work would include the following: slowing down the three pool pumps that run 24/7; retrofitting 15 roof top HVAC units by changing the interior controls to regulate the fans, and capturing the heat that comes from the HVAC units and re-feeding the heated air into the units; lighting improvements; and additional insulation for the natatorium. Mr. Wolfe noted that there is also \$33,000 expenditure for the replacement of cardio equipment.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he will provide the tables and narratives for the 2011 budget for the December 21st meeting.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Luetchford if the expenditure from the Capital Fund is \$115,000 and if he will receive \$115,000 in matching funds, it doesn't match. Mr. Luetchford noted that the total cost of the project is \$230,000, and the Township is matching the grant by paying \$115,000. Mr. Wolfe noted that the expenditure is \$230,000, with the revenue being \$115,000. Mr. Seeds questioned what the balance would be in the Capital Fund. Mr. Luetchford noted that it would be \$205,000, with another \$33,000 spent for fitness equipment. He noted that the replacement of fitness equipment has been charged to this account over the past few years.

Mr. Seeds noted that the Operating Board has decided not to increase the membership fees as it is concerned about the local competition. Mr. Luetchford suggested that it was more of a concern that the members would have the ability to pay their membership fees, and it is also a good marketing tool. He noted that it is very important to retain the current membership, noting that in the economic times it did not make sense to raise the membership fees. Mr. Crissman noted that the goal of the marketing plan is to increase membership by 5%.

Mr. Seeds questioned, with the 10% increase in taxes, how much money would be put back into the GF towards the 25% threshold. Mr. Blain answered that nothing would be put back as the budget would be drawing against the GF. He noted that the Board would draw \$100,000 against the GF balance, placing the Township below the 25% threshold by that amount. Mr. Crissman noted that is why he was asking for a commitment from the Board to reinstate the funds in the following year budget to that account.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the year-end for 2010 for the GF is expected to be \$4.8 million, however, for 2011 the projection is \$4.3 million, drawing roughly \$500,000 from that account, transferring \$831,000 to the GIF for capital projects, and the remainder made up by the 10% tax increase. Mr. Seeds noted that the Township is looking to delay the purchase of the Wolfersberger Tract until 2012. Mr. Blain answered yes. Mr. Seeds suggested that would not be a true savings as the Township would lose the income from the lease agreement. Mr. Wolfe noted that it results in a net savings of \$35,000. Mr. Blain noted if the land is paid off next year, then the Township would receive the rentals from that year going forward. He noted that the Township is deferring the long-term value by not making the last payment until next year.

Mr. Blain noted that the FC is drawing down on its fund balance and he questioned Mr. Seeds if he thought that the Township should be funding more to the FC to try to manage some of the capital needs. Mr. Seeds answered no, as the Township should not be paying more for the FC. Mr. Seeds noted if the Township pays \$10,000 towards Wolfersberger Tract this year it would be losing a projected \$7,000 in rentals. Mr. Wolfe explained that the Township is negotiating a \$5,000 amendment amount and the Board would have to approve an amended sales agreement in January.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Wolfe had \$75,000 in the budget for the pavement management program, but he thought it was only going to cost \$50,000. Mr. Wolfe explained that he expects to break out the mini-basin programs and not including them in the overall inventory of municipal streets since they will be dug up anyway. He noted that it could provide for a savings, but for budget purposes, he included the entire amount. Mr. Seeds questioned if \$15,000 was put in the budget for design work for a wash bay for Public Works. Mr. Wolfe answered no. Mr. Seeds questioned if the \$4,000 was included for the fireworks donation to the Linglestown Fire Company. Mr. Wolfe noted that it was included in the GF.

Mr. Hawk questioned if everything was okay. Mr. Seeds noted that it was not okay. Mr. Wolfe noted that this would be the time to make changes since the Board is running out of time. Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Seeds is against the tax increase. Mr. Seeds answered yes, noting that the Board should have enacted a tax increase two to three years ago. He noted that he understands that the FC Operating Board does not want to raise membership rates and he does not want to raise taxes, however, he knows that the Board will not be able to do what needs to be done. He noted that the Public Works Department needs an addition to their building. Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Seeds what he was suggesting. Mr. Seeds stated that he was not suggesting anything, noting that he does not have the information that the FC Operating Board has, noting that he is concerned about spending down the Capital Fund. Mr. Crissman noted that the expenditures for the FC are for items that need to be done, noting that the matching grant funds provided an opportunity to only pay half of the costs for the energy improvements. He questioned if it would prudent to wait to spend the entire \$230,000 out of Township funds or only spend \$115,000 of the Township funds. Mr. Seeds questioned how long it would take to recoup the \$115,000 in energy savings. Mr. Hawk agreed with Mr. Crissman questioning why you would spend the money later when you could get half of the funds in a grant now. Mr. Seeds noted that he understands that, but what bothers him is that the Board is spending capital funds to replace equipment. He noted that should be a normal operating cost and the membership dues should pay for the replacement of the equipment.

Mr. Blain questioned if Mr. Luetchford raised the membership rates 3% what would it mean for additional revenues. Mr. Luetchford noted that the current revenues are a little less \$1 million, noting that it would provide for an additional \$3,000. Mr. Blain suggested that it would pay for the replacement of the equipment. Mr. Luetchford noted that he must replace equipment every year and in the past he has raised the rates every year. Mr. Blain questioned if the Operating Board felt very strongly about not raising the membership rates. Mr. Luetchford noted that the Board discussed it at great lengths and that is what it decided. He noted that the FC CIF received its revenues from leftover revenues for operations for the FC. He noted, now, those funds are being used to help pay for items that have no funding. He noted that although it is called the CIF, it was not intended to be used only for capital improvements. Mr. Wolfe explained that it is a capital fund that can be used to replace anything. He explained that the way the FC budgets are

structured, if the FC has a year in the black, it does not get to keep the money to use for future operations, it must be rolled into the capital fund. He noted that every year the FC budget must stand on its own, and it can not offset a bad year with a good year. Mr. Hawk noted that raising the fees does not amount to a large amount of money, and people are constantly reevaluating their expenditures and the FC membership is one they can easily cut out of their own personal budget. He noted that people are amending their buying habits.

Mr. Hawk noted that he has been very open with the people who have asked him about a tax increase, and he has explained to them that the Board is looking to implement a 10% tax increase that would amount to roughly \$17.50 per home owner of a home appraised at \$200,000. He noted that they do not seem to have a problem with it. Mr. Seeds noted that he has received the opposite response. Mr. Hawk noted that the Board needs to provide a certain quality of living for its residents. Mr. Blain noted that the Board could balance the budget without a tax increase but it means that items need to be eliminated. He noted if you want to include the pavement and general ledger management systems, it will cost some money to do that. He noted dropping those two programs would get the Board close to the number to balance the budget. Mr. Seeds noted that the Board would not be doing what it needs to do. Mr. Blain noted that the Board would not be able to implement capital projects that are beneficial and cost-saving to the Township. Mr. Hawk questioned if \$17 would put someone in the poor house. Mr. Seeds noted that it is a combination of all the increases that add up.

Mr. Hawk questioned Mr. Seeds what his recommendation is. Mr. Seeds noted that he does not want to increase taxes. Mr. Crissman noted that all the Board members are in that position, however, the fact is to keep the municipality moving forward to maintain what it is currently doing and to continue to do things that will save the Township in the long run, the Board has to make a hard decision to raise taxes. He questioned when the last time the Board raised taxes in the community. He noted that 10% is only a \$17.50 increase. He noted that he has explained that reason for the tax increase to many people and they tell him that they understand why it is being done. Mr. Blain noted that he has explained this to people and they asked him when the last time the taxes were raised. He noted once he explains that it was over 20 years ago, and how much it will cost, they are okay with it especially for the services that they are receiving from the Township. He noted that a few people do not make up a survey of the entire Township,

but the reality is that the Township should have raised taxes a few years ago. He noted that the citizens have gained the time value of money in that the Board did not raise taxes years ago. He noted that they would have been paying the extra \$17.50 for a couple of years. He noted that the Board has balanced the budget by dipping into the capital reserves to do projects when the Board could have raised taxes to pay for the projects.

Mr. Hawk noted that he received supportive comments while attending the SWAN Holiday Party last evening. Mr. Ted Robertson noted that he has been talking to people and he has not received any negative comments. He noted when you explained the millage rate and how it compares to the bordering municipalities, it is understandable. Mr. Hawk noted that no one wants a tax increase, and he would rather not have one, but when you have 47,000 people enjoying a good standard of living in the Township, it is necessary to keep up and not fall behind. He noted that the Board has cut \$350,000 from stormwater upgrades, \$153,000 for George Park improvements, offered early retirements, and is now requiring the police officers to contribute toward their pensions. He noted that you can only cut so far until you hit an artery.

Mr. Blain explained that people move to this community because of the great park system, and at this time, the Township is unable to finish the work in George Park. He noted that it has been open for four years, and the Township doesn't have the funds to finish the work. He noted that it will not be done next year, and sooner or later the Township will get to the point where there are numerous projects that need funded, and if the Board doesn't increase the revenue base, then the Board will get further behind, and be forced to implement an even higher tax increase and that will get the residents attention. Mr. Seeds noted that he understands that, and everyone hopes that the economy will rebound. He noted that he disagrees with the 25% threshold in the savings, noting that it needs to be a 50% threshold. He noted that he does not agree with raising taxes only to keep the threshold at 25%. Mr. Blain explained that the tax increase will not maintain the 25% threshold as it will fall below that, even with the tax increase. Mr. Crissman noted that the question is how low do you want to go. He noted that he has a concern that the Board does not continue to take from that fund until there is nothing left. He noted that he never wants to be in that position.

Mr. Blain suggested that Mr. Seeds is asking what constitutes an emergency for the use of the money. Mr. Seeds suggested that he thinks that it is okay to spend the funds because he is

hoping that the goods times will come back and then it can be built back up. He noted that it is unknown when that will occur.

Mr. Crissman questioned what Mr. Seeds wants to do as the budget needs to be placed on the agenda for next week. Mr. Seeds noted that he is only one person. Mr. Crissman questioned what Mr. Seeds is not in support of; and he noted that he could not say that he does not want to raise taxes because that is inevitable. Mr. Seeds noted that it is the same thing with the 25%. Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Seeds was opposing the 25% threshold. Mr. Seeds noted that he has lost money in his retirement funds. Mr. Crissman noted that everyone has lost money in their retirement funds. Mr. Seeds noted that he can't bring his retirement funds back to the level it was originally, noting that he does not have today what he used to have, and he questioned what he could do to bring it back, especially for people living on social security and a small pension. He noted that those people are not able to recoup what they lost in the economy, and now they will be looking at a tax increase. Mr. Seeds noted that the Board is looking to raise taxes to keep the 25% threshold. He noted that some people can't keep that level since they lost money, and it may never come back. Mr. Hawk noted that is mainly for the large national level. Mr. Seeds noted that it is on a personal level. Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Seeds has personally lost funds, and he hopes that the interest and savings levels go back up again.

Mr. Blain noted that the Township can hope that the economy is going to recover and be like it was five or ten years ago, but the Township needs to deal with where it is today and in his mind, it has a budget with a hole and the Board need to make a decision to raise taxes or not to raise taxes. He explained that he is not a proponent for raising taxes but realizing where the revenue level is for property tax compared to every other revenue source, raising taxes 10% only provides for an overall increase in revenues of 1%. He noted that he does not see any problem with that. He noted that the Township has an \$18 million budget and property tax revenues only make up \$2.5 million of that, and the Board is only talking about raising taxes \$250,000. He noted that the Board is talking about raising the total revenues for the Township by 1.5%.

Mr. Hawk noted that there have been people on welfare for as long as he can remember and if the economy had a dramatic turn around tomorrow morning it will not get everyone off of welfare. He noted that there will always be people who are struggling.

Mr. Blain noted if there is a concern about taxation, then the focus should not be on property tax, rather it should be changing the EIT rate from .5% to .4% as it would have a larger impact on everyone in the community, noting that real estate taxes only focuses on the property owners. He noted that the income from the EIT is almost \$7 million. He noted that a reduction in the EIT would make a huge impact on people and he suggested that Mr. Seeds should not get too hung up on the raising of the property taxes since it is such a small piece of the overall revenue income. Mr. Seeds noted that it is but it has the most impact on those people on fixed incomes, those that don't pay EIT since they are retired. Mr. Blain noted that he looks at it differently since he is from a different generation. Mr. Crissman noted that he feels sorry for those people on fixed incomes, but there are just as many young couples starting out with young children that are struggling. Mr. Blain noted that is where he is coming from. He noted that the people in their 20's and 30's who have started families in this tough economy and are not getting any raises, are out there working, and raising the real estate tax \$17 a year will also impact them as well, but the bigger impact would be if you cut their EIT. He noted that it is not just people on fixed incomes that are impacted, everyone is impacted.

Mr. Hawk noted that the Board could sit here and hash this thing back and forth forever, but the thing to do is to put it on the agenda for the December 21st meeting, and let the chips fall where they may.

Mr. Crissman noted when we do the comparatives of millage for each local municipality, the Township is unique in that it contributes .041 for a library tax that many other municipalities do not have. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township, other than Derry Township, is the only municipality in Dauphin County that pays a library tax for both the County and the Township. Mr. Crissman noted if the Township took its current millage rate and deducted the .041 from the rate, it would even be lower. He explained for all the services the Township provides in comparison to other municipalities around us, the Township gets a lot for its revenues to benefit the community. Mr. Crissman noted that he did not know if the Township was unique in its fire protection tax. Mr. Wolfe noted that all of the municipalities have some type of fire tax. Mr. Blain agreed.

Mr. Blain questioned Mr. Seeds if he was against raising taxes, then the Board would need to make some tough long-term decisions in regards to staffing. He noted that not raising

taxes at this time and penny pinch projects, does not resolve the long-term issue since the projects need to be done sooner or later and there continues the need to find a way to fund them. He suggested that the only way to balance the budget in his mind is to cut personnel as it is the only long-term fixed savings. He suggested if you don't want to raise taxes, then the solution would not be removing small projects from the budget that could ultimately provide a savings to the Township for the long-term, rather the long-term fix would be to cut six employees effective January 1st. Mr. Seeds noted during the 1990's the Township built up a nice fund, due to the economic times, more EIT, building permit fees, realty transfer taxes, noting that the Township is down on revenues due to the economy. He suggested that the income level has been reduced by \$1 million to \$1.5 million. He noted if the economy improves, then he does not think the Township needs to raise taxes since it would level out. Mr. Crissman noted that the Board needs to maintain its reserve fund and it can't keep taking from it to deplete it. He asked Mr. Seeds what the Board should do if it keeps using the money and nothing is left. Mr. Blain noted that he is trying to deal with where the Board is today, and no one knows where the economy will be tomorrow or two or three years from now. He noted that many economists suggest that the economy is experiencing the new normal, so if the Board is to balance the budget without raising taxes, then it needs to take a more conservative approach and cut its fixed expense base to make it match the current revenue stream, and in order to do that it needs to find \$250,000, and the only way to do that is to cut payroll. He noted that Mr. Seeds would have to make a decision to cut five or six employees. Mr. Seeds noted that we could be here all night discussing the issue. He noted that we could talk about the federal level as they are extending the tax breaks and look at the national debt. He noted that it is the same thing. He suggested that the government should be raising federal taxes due to the deficit and not voting to extend the tax cuts. Mr. Crissman noted that the Board needs to talk about what is good for Lower Paxton Township. Mr. Hawk noted that the Board has no control over the federal tax system. He noted that everything Mr. Seeds is saying is based upon "what if". Mr. Crissman noted that the Board cannot do a "what if" budget.

Mr. Blain noted if Mr. Seeds was running his own business and he was in a situation where he did not want to raise rates for his customers but the fixed expense base was causing a deficit, what would he do. Mr. Seeds noted that he would cut his expenses. Mr. Hawk noted that

the Township has done that. Mr. Blain stated that maybe we haven't and we need to go back into the budget and cut employees. He noted that is what Mr. Seeds is trying to get to. Mr. Seeds noted that he does not want to raise taxes to keep a 25% threshold. Mr. Hawk noted that the Board is not doing it to keep the surplus. He Seeds noted that he would want the pavement and financial management programs put back into the budget. Mr. Hawk noted that the Board chose to keep those two programs in the budget since in the long run it will save the Township money.

Mr. Hawk noted that the budget should be put on the agenda for the next Township meeting and any further discussion will have to be dealt with at that time.

Mr. Blain noted if the economy would recover it would ultimately increase the EIT and reality transfer tax revenues, and then the Board could revisit the property tax revenue and maybe reduce it. Mr. Hawk noted that is reacting to the "what if". Mr. Seeds noted that he did not say how he would vote for the budget. Mr. Crissman noted if you are going to vote for the budget then the Board has just wasted 45 minutes. Mr. Seeds noted at this point Mr. Hornung is in favor of a tax increase, so if he votes no, the vote would be four to one. He noted that to be a team player, he will probably vote in favor of the budget since it will pass anyway. He noted that this is what they do in Washington, D.C. all the time. Mr. Crissman questioned if this is a political vote or a vote for what is in the best interest in the community. Mr. Seeds noted that his vote is always for the best interest in the community. Mr. Crissman noted that what you just said sounded like a political response. Mr. Seeds noted that a lot of times we do that. Mr. Crissman stated that he never does that. Mr. Hawk noted that this conversation should be brought to an end and he stated to Mr. Seeds that the Board is at the eleventh hour and we have to move along.

Review of proposed increases to municipal fees and charges

Mr. Wolfe explained that he was directed by the Board to review the various fees and charges that are levied by the municipality, and he along with staff has done this and has put the increase in fees for the various items in Resolution format for the Board members to review. He noted that the fees and charges do not pertain to the enterprise funds for the Authority or the FC. He noted that he did not review the Parks and Recreation charges and fees as they are typically increased on a yearly basis. He noted that the Resolutions cover the fees and charges that are administrative and operate out of the Township Municipal Center.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he had a long list that shows the current fee and the proposed change for 2011. He noted that during the budget process it was discussed to increase the Compost Permit fees by 50% from \$20 for a residential yearly pass to \$30. He noted that the one-day pass for residential customers is proposed to go from \$5 to \$7.50; however Mr. Hornung, who sells the passes at his business, suggested that it would be much easier to collect the fees if it was \$8. Mr. Hawk agreed and suggested that the \$37.50 fee should be increased to \$38.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the current amount means for the year or when the amount was last changed. Mr. Wolfe explained that is when it was first implemented or the last time the amount was changed.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the last change to the sign permit fees occurred in 2007. He noted that he proposes an increase in the overall sign schedule of 50%. He noted that many zoning fees were adopted in 2005 and 2006. He proposed an increase in the application fees of \$250 fee for residential and \$425 fee for non-residential to \$300 for residential and \$500 for non-residential. He noted that the proposed fee for escrow deposits for temporary and political signs have increased, however, if the applicant follows the rules, the money will be returned. He noted that the zoning ordinance amendment fee would be increased from \$750 to \$1,000. He noted that the peddler and solicitor fees were increased last in 2006, and the proposed changes are to increase the primary fee from \$25 to \$50 and additional permits from \$5 to \$10. He noted the fee for Public Works to install stop bars and pavement arrows are \$125 and regulatory and street name signs are \$175, and he is proposing to increase all fees to \$300. He explained that there has been a significant increase in the cost of the materials in addition to staff time to install the items. He noted that there is nothing to prevent a developer from installing their own signs, but they know that it is much cheaper to have the Township do the installation.

Mr. Wolfe noted for subdivision and land development, it is currently a \$200 base fee plus \$10 per lot, and he is proposing a change to a \$300 base fee and \$15 per lot. He noted this would be the same for final plans, and if the two are combined into one, the fee would be \$500 and \$25 per lot. He noted that the increases are similar for land development, noting the current fee of \$200 increases to \$300, and \$300 to \$500. He proposed a 25% increase in plumbing permit fees noting that the last increase occurred in 2005. He noted that the building permit fee

for residential was last changed in 2005, and the proposed fees of 38% is suggested. He noted that the increase for non-residential is proposed at an increase of 11%

Mr. Wolfe noted that the transient merchant license, flea market, and merchant licenses are currently \$300 per year and he plans to increase it to \$400 and the monthly fee would increase from \$25 to \$50. He noted that a Bring Your Own Bottle (BYOB) permit would increase noting that the Township has only issued one BYOB permit. He noted that illegal parking would increase from \$10 to \$15, and there would be an additional increase in the schedule for those fees.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would like to review all the proposed resolutions, but the most important would be the building permit changes. He noted that it has the potential to generate more revenue than all the others put together. He noted that Resolution 10-33-10 would cover building permits, and in the past, the Township has garnered a significant amount of revenue from building permits. He noted that he has proposed a minor increase since the fees have not been increased since 2005. He proposed a more significant increase for commercial permits, not because they should be penalized, but because they are not paying their fare share. He noted that the Resolution's first paragraph shows the formula for a single family home using a dollar figure per one thousand dollars of construction costs which is based upon \$50 per foot. He noted that you would not build much for a residential home for \$50 per foot. He distributed a survey of the neighboring permit fees and how they calculate building permits. He noted that the cost of a building permit is typically a dollar amount per thousand. He noted in Lower Paxton Township it is \$6.30 per \$1,000 of construction costs. He noted for Derry Township, the cost ranges from \$5.18 to \$7.76 per \$1,000 of construction costs. He noted that Susquehanna Township is \$20 per \$1,000, Swatara Township is \$8 per \$1,000; Hampton Township is \$10 per \$1,000; and Lower Swatara Township is \$4 per \$1,000. He noted that Lower Paxton Township has the lowest since it computes construction costs based upon \$50 a square foot and all the others are either based upon market value, a contract with builder, construction bid, or \$80 per square foot. He noted that the \$6 per \$1,000 number is way under the market value number. He noted for a 2,500 square foot home which should cost about \$250,000 to construct, the building permit fee in Lower Paxton Township would be \$976.50; Derry Township, \$1,447; Susquehanna Township, \$5,000; Swatara Township, \$1,715.20; Hampden Township, \$2,500; and Lower Swatara

Township, \$1,400. He suggested that the proposed increase would change the Township's permit fee to \$1,441.50.

Mr. Wolfe distributed a list of the ten most recent permits issued for both single-family homes and townhomes, and the lowest permit fee was \$784.35 for a 3,068 square foot single-family home and \$686.07 for a 2,698 square foot townhome. He noted that it is terrible to increase the fees for residential construction, but when you look at what and how the Township is charging, you find that it is significantly undercharging residential construction permit fees as compared to the neighboring municipalities.

He noted that what he proposed was \$6.60 per \$1,000, and increasing the construction cost multipliers to \$75 and \$50. He noted that the Township needs to get the construction cost multiplier as close to reality as possible. He noted that you could be well served by leaving that number alone and just increasing the multiplier, but if you leave that number alone, then you would not provide an increase for non-residential projects unless you establish a separate fee for them. He noted that the other municipal formulas are far more complicated than the Township's. He noted if it is changed to \$6.60 per square foot, it would be an 11% increase in the per foot multiplier, and by increasing the market value figures for single family it would get the permit fees closer to reality. Mr. Hawk noted that the increase would still be lower than most of the adjoining municipalities. He noted that a permit of \$6.60 per \$1,000 and \$75 per square foot for finish and \$50 per square foot for unfinished, would be \$1,514. Mr. Seeds noted that \$75 per square foot for construction costs is low. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be equal with Derry Township, higher than Lower Swatara Township, and under Hampden, Swatara, and Susquehanna Townships rates.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Resolution 10-33-01 would increase the Compost Facility fees to \$30 per calendar year for residential use, and \$450 for landscape contractor. He noted that the one-day permit fee would be \$8 for residents and \$38 for contractors. He noted that Resolution 10-33-02 for sign permit fees would increase 50%. He noted that Resolution 10-33-03 would cover zoning permit fees, special exceptions, conditional uses, variances, appeals of codes officers' decision, increasing from \$250 and \$425 to \$300 and \$500. He noted that the application to amend a zoning ordinance has changed from \$750 to \$1000. Mr. Seeds questioned if the changes reflect the actual costs of staff time. Mr. Wolfe answered no, since

staff time differs on each individual item. He suggested that it would be an average based upon Zoning Hearing Board costs, stenographer's costs, minutes, advertising, etc.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Resolution 10-33-04 for Peddlers and Solicitors would increase to \$50 for a primary permit and \$10 for the secondary permit. He noted the Resolution for 10-33-05 for subdivision and land development, the fee charged by the Township for the engineer review would be the fee schedule provided by the Township Engineer. He noted that this has been what the Township has been charging but it did not have a resolution in place.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Resolution 10-33-06 for stop bars and arrows installations is proposed to be increased to \$300.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Resolution 10-33-07 for subdivision and land development plans would increase for the preliminary subdivision plan from \$200 plus \$10 per lot to \$300 plus \$15 per lot. He noted the preliminary/final subdivision plan would increase from \$300 plus \$15 per lot to \$500 plus \$25 per lot. He noted that the preliminary land development plan would increase from \$100 plus \$20 per acre, to \$300 plus \$30 per acre. He noted for a final land development plan, it would increase from \$200 plus \$20 per acre, to \$300 plus \$30 per acre. He noted that a preliminary/final land development plan would increase from \$300 plus \$30 per acre, to \$500 plus \$45 per acre.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Resolution 10-33-08 for regulatory and warning signs is the fees charged by the Township when the developer chooses not to install their own signage. He noted that these fees increased from \$125 for a stop bar, \$175 for an arrow, \$125 for a regulatory sign, \$150 for a street sign, to \$300 for all signs.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Resolution 10-33-09 would propose an increase in fees for plumbing permits based upon the type of fixture. He noted that he already discussed the building fee permits.

Mr. Wolfe noted that transient merchant and flea market fees are slated to increase from \$300 to \$400 and \$25,000 to \$50,000.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board discussed the BYOB permit fees, and also the solicitor review fees, and illegal parking fees.

Mr. Seeds had a question regarding the commercial contract for plumbing permits listing each ten fixtures. He explained that he did not understand that. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would have to research that more.

Mr. Wolfe questioned if the Board members wanted to consider any or all of the resolutions for Board action at the next business meeting. Mr. Crissman stated that all of them should be considered. Mr. Hawk agreed. Mr. Seeds questioned if the other fees are in line with the other municipalities. Mr. Wolfe noted that he did not do a comprehensive survey of all the fees charges by the neighboring municipalities as it would take hours to do. He noted that most of the fees have not been increased in five years and it is not unreasonable to assume that they are undervalued at this point in time. Mr. Wolfe noted that he may be bringing additional increases for other fees in the future. He noted that the Board would also have to act on two ordinances to allow the Board to set the fees by resolution, and they will be on the agenda as well. He noted two of the fees were previously set by ordinance, and they need to be amended by ordinance to allow their fees to be set by a resolution.

Mr. Seeds questioned if a motorist hits a sign with a vehicle, does their insurance company pay to replace the sign. PSD Johnson answered yes, noting that the Police Department will notify the Public Works Department and they will bill the person's insurance company. Mr. Seeds noted that the motorist would not have to pay for it; rather their insurance company would pay for it. He questioned if \$300 is the actual coast to replace a sign. Mr. Wolfe answered that the staff has to place a PA one-call, then they have to purchase a new post and sign, and the cost for aluminum signs have increased substantially. Mr. Seeds noted that the new federal regulations require larger and reflective material for the signs. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would include at least two hours of staff time for two employees to replace the sign.

Review of operational changes being implemented by South Central EMS

Public Safety Director (PSD) Johnson explained that he requested a member of the South Central Emergency Medical Services (SCEMS) attend the meeting but was told that they could not attend since they had an Executive Board Meeting tonight.

PSD Johnson noted that he would like to update the Board members on changes that recently took place within the SCEMS organization. He noted that these changes took place on October 31, 2010. He noted that the changes were made upon the direction of their Board of Directors. He explained that they closed the Peiffers Lane Station #4, located in Lower Paxton Township. He noted that the shift supervisor has been relocated to the West Hanover Township Station #2, and he will remain there until such time that the new Popular Street Station is completed in the Township behind the Paxtonia Fire Company. He noted that SCEMS phased out one of their daylight Mobile Intensive Care Units (MICU) which was working 7 a.m. to 4 p.m. He noted that this unit has been in service for the past five years, and the four full time staff members from that unit were moved into EMT/Paramedic positions that were currently vacant and staffed by part-time employees. He noted that that move is expected to generate substantial cost savings to address the budget shortfall from the past two years. He noted that the non-emergency ParaTransit services will be cut in half to address the decrease in the current demand to save costs. He noted that they have cut their daily service from five vans to three at most. He noted with these changes, there may be occasions when SCEMS will need mutual aid from other agencies outside of Lower Paxton Township. He noted that SCEMS has indicated that they will continue to follow the trends and if there is a sustained missed-call rate they will look at reinstating one or more of the units. He noted that there will be no changes to the Middletown, West Hanover Township, or Paxtonia Stations. He noted that they will continue to be staffed 24/7 with a supervisor, battalion chief, and advanced life support staff.

PSD Johnson noted that SCEMS is facing tough budget times just like everyone else. He noted that they have reduced expenses and have updated their proposed revenues for 2010 and 2011. He noted that he has some significant concerns about their financial future. He explained that their vehicles are at the end of their lifespan, with many vehicles' mileage at 300,000 or more, and he has not seen a replacement plan for the equipment. He noted that their call volume is down as other agencies are providing competition for the ParaTransit services. He noted that SCMES increased their rates; however, their call volume is down by 30%.

Mr. Crissman noted that the municipal contribution to SCEMS is \$357,000, and he questioned what the break out is for the other municipalities. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township

is budgeted to pay \$247,000 in 2011. Mr. Crissman questioned what the Township paid in 2010. Mr. Wolfe answered that it was \$247,000.

Mr. Blain noted that PSD Johnson stated that the call volume is down. PSD Johnson answered that the rate is down 30%. Mr. Blain questioned if SCEMS has been impacted by the other ambulance agencies in the area. PSD Johnson noted that is true only for transports, and not for emergencies. Mr. Blain noted that the ParaTransit service was SCEMS's, biggest source of revenues. Mr. Seeds noted that it is the only category providing a profit margin. He noted when he questioned the budget; the Executive Board had already accepted the budget before it was voted on. He noted when SCEMS proposed to open the station on Peiffers Lane, their numbers showed that it would be a big money maker, and obviously it wasn't. He noted that they have not laid anyone off as they are moving the people around, and the only place they experienced a savings was for the need for less part-time employee's hours. He noted every time he asks them questions about this he gets nowhere. He noted that there is no way they can make the projected budget numbers based upon this budget. He noted that the Board asks for a motion to approve the budget and he never gets any answers. He noted that it is very frustrating to be on the Board as they never answer your questions. Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Seeds' questions are very valid. He stated that he is upset about the fact that the Board gives SCEMS \$247,000 and year and they can't find a way to send a representative to the Board's meeting.

Mr. Seeds noted that he is the Board's representative and has been doing this for years, and he is just as frustrated as ever. He noted that the payroll taxes for 2011 are projected to be \$77,300, and the year-end projection for 2010 is \$127,500. He noted that is near half of what is projected for this year. He noted that the group insurance is \$218,000 for 2010 and projected to be \$65,000 in 2011 and all SCEMS did was to lay off some part-time personnel. He noted that it is ridiculous. Mr. Blain noted when you discuss payroll costs, why don't they provide the projected head count for 2011. Mr. Seeds noted that the Executive Board already did this. Mr. Blain noted if Mr. Seeds is challenging their figures, why can't they produce the projected head count for 2011. Mr. Wolfe explained that the purpose is to relay information only to the Board members. He noted that SCEMS owes the Township an annual budget report and they are also explaining their operational changes which include closing a station in Lower Paxton Township and opening a new station on Peach Street which the Board never supported. He noted that they

are reducing service within the community based upon what they say is a reduction in call volume.

Mr. Crissman noted that SCEMS is not getting the \$247,000 donation until they send a representative to the meeting to address the Board's questions. Mr. Blain questioned if the 30% reduction in call volumes is for emergency calls or transports. PSD Johnson answered that is for the emergency calls, and they attribute it to people who wait longer to call an ambulance due to the costs, or they are refusing ambulances, or they transport themselves to the hospital. He noted that there may be a lot of truth to that. He noted, in some instances people wait too long, and it is too late.

PSD Johnson noted that he, Mr. Wolfe, and Mr. Hornung met with SCEMS last year and they were projecting a 30% increase in calls, and he and Mr. Wolfe predicted that SCEMS would not experience the increase in calls. Mr. Blain questioned if they are blaming the drop in the call volume on the economy and not competition. Mr. Hawk noted that he does not seem to see as many of their vehicles roaming the streets. Mr. Blain agreed. Mr. Seeds noted that the calls are not down that much, and in fact, for some months, the call volume is higher. He noted for a three months period, the calls were higher than 2009 numbers.

Mr. Blain suggested that the Township is stuck since it has no alternative service to provide. He noted that the Township is not capable of providing the service itself. Mr. Crissman noted that he does not want to be held hostage. PSD Johnson noted that the report shows a decrease of 31.77% for transports for the year.

Mr. Blain questioned what the consequences would be if the Township did not support SCEMS, or the operation folded. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township would have to establish a service and operate it or contract with someone. Mr. Blain noted that Susquehanna Township is not a full paramedic group, and provides a lower level of service. He questioned how SCEMS could be in such a financial crisis all of a sudden, noting that they have lost call volume for transports. He noted if the transports are down due to competition, then they must step up to the plate and get there first. PSD Johnson noted that the information that he and Mr. Seeds receives is limited.

PSD Johnson noted for the past several years they have been meeting expenses through a line of credit, and the bank called the lines of credit due, and they had to re-mortgage their West

Hanover Township building. He questioned how they will meet their expenses in 2011, especially since they had multiple lines of credit. Mr. Seeds noted that they have \$377,000 in a line of credit and have only paid interest and no principal. He noted that M&T Bank called them and informed that that they would no longer have a line of credit and they pulled the mortgage on the West Hanover Township building. He noted that M&T forced SCEMS to combine the mortgage and line of credit into one mortgage at an interest rate of 7%. Mr. Crissman noted that this is all more the reason to have someone from their operations meet with our Board.

Mr. Hawk noted that having been in the health care industry for 20 years, ambulance services have a history of coming and going, and they never seem to be able to sustain their operations. He noted that there has been a lot of transition over the years, and he questioned how this can be changed. PSD Johnson noted it can be changed with proper management. He noted that he does not have enough information from SCEMS; however it appears to him that they are overstaffed, guaranteed overtime, and mismanaged. He noted that the Police Department is a 24/7 operation and SCEMS had 37 more employees than he does in the Police Department. He noted that they have 86 people to his 42 patrol officers.

Mr. Blain questioned who is on their Board. Mr. Seeds answered that it is whoever they want to appoint. Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Seeds stated that it does not matter what they do, the Executive Board makes all the decision and they are meeting tonight. He noted that they always meet on the same night he has a Township meeting. PSD Johnson suggested that they are uncomfortable when Mr. Seeds shows up at the meeting. Mr. Crissman noted if they are borrowing to make the daily expenses, then they will come to the Township noting that they are bankrupt looking for help. Mr. Blain noted that the only way to fix it would be to have the Township provide the service for its own people. Mr. Wolfe noted that he was not looking for a fix tonight, just to make the Board aware of what is going on.

Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Wolfe if the Board budgeted \$247,000 for this year. Mr. Wolfe answered that was what was budgeted for the SCEMS annual allocation. Mr. Crissman noted that the Board should hold SCEMS accountable. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is hard to hold someone accountable when you really don't have any authority over them other than money. Mr. Hawk noted that \$247,000 sounds like a lot of authority to him. Mr. Crissman noted that the

overall municipal contribution is \$365,000 and out of that amount the Township pays \$247,000. Mr. Seeds noted that they owe over \$1 million in outstanding funds.

PSD Johnson noted that much of their budget is based upon accounts receivable and the collection rate is only 50% to 60%. He suggested that they are overstating that amount. Mr. Seeds noted that last year they had \$750,000 in outstanding receipts. He explained that Medicare is paying the same or less than what they paid in the past. He noted there are less calls, less money coming in, mismanagement of the operations, and it spells disaster. PSD Johnson noted when you operate a number of years with multiple lines of credit; there is some form of mismanagement.

Mr. Blain questioned the likelihood that they would shut down operations and what is the Township's contingency plan. PSD Johnson answered that the choices are Susquehanna Township, Harrisburg Hospital or PinnacleHealth. Mr. Crissman questioned what about using the competition that was mentioned earlier. PSD Johnson noted that Advantage is only a transport agency, but he was told that they want to get into other operations. He suggested that those companies move into areas where there are distressed ambulance companies, they set up shop doing transports only, and wait for the ambulance associations to go under, and then take over the emergency response calls. Mr. Blain noted that he found it very interesting that the Board held discussions with SCEMS about occupying the former Colonial Park Fire Station and they stated that they were not interested in using that facility, however, Advantage took over that site and now they are a primary competition for SCEMS. He noted that SCEMS has closed the Union Deposit Station. Mr. Crissman suggested that the Board should invite Advantage to a meeting to discuss options with them. Mr. Blain noted that an acquaintance called him about providing ambulance service and he stated that he would return a call that person to find out what he knows about this issue. He explained that his friend runs for-profit organizations that provides EMS services.

Mr. Seeds noted that Advantage is taking the cream of the crop and they get 80% to 100% of the money for the transports, however, this is not true for the ambulance calls. He explained that there is money in transports. PSD Johnson noted that they only have to employ EMTs. Mr. Hawk noted that Susquehanna Township's ambulance service is basically for transports. PSD Johnson noted that originally the medics only did transport and only responded

to emergency calls when other ambulances were unavailable. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it would be his recommendation to ask members from SCEMS to attend a workshop meeting to answer the Board's questions. Mr. Crissman noted that he would also like to speak to Advantage as well, and to let SCEMS know that the Township is speaking to another organization. PSD Johnson noted that he was told by SCEMS that they would be more than happy to attend a meeting, but would like to know what questions would be asked in order to be prepared to answer those questions.

Request from Cider Press Associates, LLC, to discuss
comments to the Shadebrook final subdivision plan

Mr. Forrest Troutman noted that he represents the Cider Press Associates, LLC, and he would like to discuss the plan as it is his intention to bring the final plan for Phase 1 to the Board of Supervisors' December 21st meeting. He noted that he has been communicating with Mr. Fleming from HRG, and it is his belief that three of the four issues have been resolved.

Mr. Troutman explained that Shadebrook is a Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND), a multi-use development that he has been working on for a number of years. He noted that more items need to be completed, and he needs to secure a joint permit that will not be available before April or May, and that would be the last step for the conditional use. He noted that he is working with Mr. Stine to put together a Developer's Agreement. He explained the plan will be recorded and infrastructure will be completed so by the time the economy has improved, they will be building homes.

Mr. Troutman noted that he is requesting an additional waiver, noting that staff did not prefer to voice an opinion for this as it has to do with paving compensation. He explained that the Planning Commission (PC) stated that the ordinance required one thing, however, he was looking for something less. He noted that Mr. Fleming had a concern for the amount of road strength provided and he has worked through the engineering items with him, but there is a need for a waiver. Mr. Hawk questioned if that had to do with the base. Mr. Troutman answered that it has to do with the composition of the roadway. Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Troutman wanted to do the paving in two phases instead of three. Mr. Troutman noted that he was planning to do the paving in three phases as opposed to four phases. He noted that the ordinance requires four pavement levels. He noted that he met with Mr. Fleming about this change and is fine with the

proposal. Mr. Fleming noted that what Mr. Troutman is proposing from an engineering standpoint, is the same strength however it removes one of the pavement courses, and addresses the water infiltration during construction by using a binder mix, which is a denser mix of asphalt for the base. He noted that the only remaining item is that the pavement section is different from what is in the old ordinance, noting that this is the second plan coming through that has this pavement section in it. Mr. Wolfe questioned Mr. Fleming if he finds the alternative acceptable. Mr. Fleming answered, from an engineering standpoint; it is a section that provides equal strength to what the ordinance calls for.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the other three items have been resolved, noting that he would like to review them before next Tuesday night. He noted if he does not get a positive recommendation from Mr. Fleming, his vote will be no. Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Fleming was okay with the waiver request for the minor streets and alleys paving. Mr. Fleming answered yes.

Mr. Brian Engle, Rettew Associates, noted that he has submitted a revised letter dated December 3rd, with the additional information requested by Mr. Fleming.

Mr. Engle noted that there is a section of pipe on an existing road that the Public Works Department has identified as deteriorating and deficient in addition to the tie-in to the inlet. He noted that he is proposing some minor stormwater increases in future phases through the 30 inch pipe. He noted that due to the condition of the pipe, the pipe has been reduced from its original 30 inches and the Public Works Department requested to replace the pipe. He noted that the applicant had agreed to replace the inlet and subsequent discussions with the client resulted in their agreement to replace the pipe. He noted that he would replace the inlet and the pipe to the discharge point, the entire 151-foot length. Mr. Seeds questioned to where the pipe discharges. Mr. Fleming noted that it would discharge to the stream on the property.

Mr. Engle noted that Mr. Fleming has requested a note be placed on the plan restricting additional impervious features such as patios and out buildings. He noted that they did not show all of the site amenities for each lot, such as a service sidewalk between the homes or a garage or patio. He noted that this would include items that a homeowner may want to add as amenities. He noted that the plan shows garages, porches, street sidewalks, but not the backyard items. He noted that with the density of the development and the lots, in many instances, there will not be a

lot that could be added to the site. He noted with the new MS4 requirements and National Pollution Discharge System (NPDS) requirements are much more restrictive as far as what you show on the plan for building. He noted when he sat down with the developer to analysis this, he realized that it would be a problem for the developer, if he is kept to that strict interpretation of what is shown on a plan. He noted that he does not even show the where service sidewalks or garages would be built. He noted that something will be put in the backyard areas, but it would not affect stormwater significantly because it would run off into the lawn, however cumulatively it could provide a negative effect. He noted that the area does not have a detention area, storm water management basins, or water ponds; rather the stormwater is collected and discharged to the creek due to its close proximity. He noted that it becomes an issue of conveyance. He questioned if additional impervious coverage is added can it be conveyed through the piping system. Mr. Hawk noted that is what MS4 is all about. Mr. Engle noted that he also has the NPDS requirements that must also be adhered to. He noted that he spoke with Mr. Fleming and he proposes to run additional calculations and believe that conveyance is not an issue as there is enough capacity in the proposed pipes and inlet to take a certain additional percentage of impervious coverage. He noted that he must review the NPDS that is covered by the Dauphin County Conservation District (DCCD) to potentially provide a Best Management Practice, more infiltration, and more inserts into inlets for water quality. He explained if Mr. Troutman receives the approval at the meeting, he is in agreement of a note to the plan that states that it restricts additional impervious features based on the fact that he will revise the plan to provide calculations to Mr. Fleming to show that each lot will have an additional amount of impervious coverage so that he will have that flexibility to provide for what the clients want to have. He noted that he is already restricted for the TND, noting that they are smaller building lots, and there is not much flexibility. He noted that some of the smaller homes could have walkout basements and they will want to build a patio. He noted that he would like to deal with it now as opposed to during the permit building process. He stated that he can prove to both Mr. Fleming and the DCCD that he can handle the water quality, but he thinks the current plan is too restrictive and he thinks that he can meet the client's needs.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Engle would revise his calculations to be comfortable with them knowing that he can meet those calculations. Mr. Troutman noted that there would

continue to be a note on the plan and he is working on the language for the note. He noted that the calculations may not be worked out before Tuesday's meeting, and the only reason he is opposed to the note currently is because if we say that we are restricted to what is on the plan now, then future patios would not be allowed. He noted that everyone will want a service walk from their home to their garage. He noted that he is working with Mr. Fleming to prove that he would have enough conveyance capacity to address those things, noting that it might be in terms of more than 15% of what is shown on the plan. He noted that he cannot draw them on the plan as he does not know where they will be located. He explained that the homeowners have to have some opportunity to make choices. He noted that he is trying to find a happy medium and he would provide a note on the plan that will address it. He explained when he applies for a building permit, it would not be just for the things that come on later, and the builders would have to do this at every stage from the ground up, so there will be plenty of opportunity to catch this along the way. He noted that he is trying to catch it at the plan stage and state that this is what we are going to build and this is the amount of impervious coverage and that the permit is restricted to this. He noted that everyone will know it, the builder, applicant, and the Township, and when the building permit is applied for, there will be another opportunity to be caught. He noted that he wants to be able to show that there is enough conveyance now to add patios and service walks without having to actually drawn them. Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Troutman will have to have wording before Tuesday's meeting so there is an agreement between the developer and the Township.

Mr. Engle noted that he proposed to work with Mr. Stine to come up with language in the conditional approval. He noted that there will be items of conditional approval, and the plan will not have the joint permit in place. He noted that there will be other items pending, and it is his goal to receive a conditional approval that we can agree to that will cover the Township and the developer. He noted that the calculations will be completed before the plan is recorded. He noted if he can't do that he will have to fall back to what the current impervious levels are. He suggested that he could have this done by next Tuesday to satisfy Mr. Stine, but he would not be able to satisfy the DCCD by next week. He explained that he hates to rush through the process. Mr. Crissman noted as long as you can guarantee Mr. Stine what he needs to recommend to the Township that would be acceptable to him. Mr. Engle noted that Mr. Troutman told him that he

needs the language to cover the developer and the Township so we all know what we are agreeing to next Tuesday. Mr. Crissman noted if Mr. Stine feels that there are still issues to be resolved next Tuesday you will not receive his support for the plan.

Mr. Seeds noted that a TND does not take into account each individual unit as far as the percentage of impervious area; rather it would be the development as a whole. He noted that one resident may want a patio or a shed, and the next person living in the area may not be able to have the same amenities because the plan has reached the limit of the impervious level. He noted that he would be against having a note on the plan since some people may want more items such as a patio, but as long as you don't exceed the amount of impervious areas you would be okay. He questioned how this would work. Mr. Fleming noted in a traditional development each lot would have 75% impervious coverage and that is how the stormwater calculations are determined. He noted as long as they do not increase the impervious coverage, they are fine. He noted with the new stormwater regulations everyone is tightening up the way they calculate the new impervious area that they are allotting for stormwater. He explained, understanding how this stormwater design was put together, he is looking to the future when the building starts and property owners wants to build a patio or extra sidewalk. He noted that he trying to figure a way to adjust the plan globally throughout the development to take the burden away from the Township to have to review it every time a building permit is submitted that deviated from the approved plan. He noted it was suggested to account for so much extra impervious and then the developer and Township would have a chart and every time a building permit was applied for the Township would keep track of the additional impervious coverage. He noted that this is troublesome from a staff's standpoint noting that someone would have to be delegated to take care of that. He suggested that it was better to come up with a per unit amount so that the salespeople know ahead of time that they could only offer an extra patio or sidewalk, and it would be finalized in the building permit, and Township staff would know this based upon the plan note. Mr. Seeds questioned how Township staff would know when the entire development has exceeded its impervious level. Mr. Troutman suggested that the person would have to go before the Homeowners Association (HOA), the architectural review committee who would approve the plan, and then they would have to apply for a building permit. Mr. Seeds noted that it would not be fair to allow one person to have a patio and not the next.

Mr. Engle noted that he had discussed keeping a running tab noting if one lot is 10% over and the next 10% under, it would be a wash. He noted that Mr. Stine is concerned about the administrative portion of the plan. He noted that the builder is still dedicated to providing that spread sheet and calculation for each lot. He noted that he has put together a spreadsheet and the developer can continue to do that, the architectural review board will continue to look at the requirements so it can provide that information up front as part of the building permit process. He noted that the fact is instead of trying to keep a running total of where we are now, he is going to try to build in that extra so he does not think he will have to nickel and dime each lot. He noted that he would continue to provide the calculation in a spreadsheet.

Mr. Seeds questioned what percentage you are permitted. Mr. Fleming answered that was where the conversation ended, and coming to the meeting tonight and next week, Mr. Troutman hopes to get approval for his plan. He recommended that they agree that they will place a note on the plan with a square footage that they can live with. He noted that until they receive the Dauphin County Conservation District approval, and their analysis, they will not know what the exact square footage is. He noted that whatever they put on the plan they will have to live with.

Mr. Seeds stated if it was 75%, then you would have to design everything not to exceed 70% so that you have the other 5% to do a patio or something else. Mr. Troutman answered that he did not think he could do it that way because with a TND density is much higher. He suggested that he has to look at what is actually shown on the plan. Mr. Seeds noted that a TND has to allow a certain percentage. Mr. Fleming noted that it has an overall density. Mr. Seeds noted that you have to count all the open lands. Mr. Engle noted that it has an overall density allowance for upgrades but there is no impervious coverage, it is taken by the requirement of open space.

Mr. Hawk noted that this is one of the most demanding TND's that has ever been put together. He noted that he, Fred Lightly, Mr. Blain, and Charles Schmehl put the plan together; to include the doors, windows, and other restrictions. He noted that Mr. Crissman and Mr. Seeds are concerned that the plan does not exceed the impervious coverage and that homeowners will not be allowed to build a patio or do other things. He suggested that they are trying to develop parameters that the developer can work within and to keep a running tab or however the situation

could be worked out. Mr. Fleming noted that he has agreed that there is extra capacity in the conveyance system but for the recording and usability of the plan, both staff and the builder must work out this one last detail that is very important and is technical in nature.

Mr. Engle noted that the last item deals with crosswalks and this request was based upon previous reviews by Mr. Fleming. He noted that there was a request that the crosswalks be made up of thermoplastic material and the maintenance be the responsibility of the HOA. He noted that after speaking with Mr. Fleming the request for the HOA has been removed. He noted that they are public streets. Mr. Seeds noted that the alleys are private streets. Mr. Troutman noted that all the alleys are private streets. Mr. Seeds noted that the HOA would be responsible for the maintenance for the alleys. Mr. Engle noted that the crosswalks are within the right-of-way because of where they tie in to the public streets. Mr. Fleming explained that the crosswalks exist in the public streets and there are none in the alleys. Mr. Engle noted that they cross the alley but they are technically in the right-of-way of the public streets. Mr. Engle noted that the developer has agreed that they will install thermoplastic crosswalks since the request of the HOA approval has been removed. Mr. Seeds noted that when the thermoplastic goes bad, then the Township will have to replace it. Mr. Fleming noted that this comment is the result of input from Mr. Robbins. He noted that the paint markings have a potential to wear out in a year, and with the retro reflectivity requirements and pavement markings and signage management they must keep track of where these things are located. He noted that the maintenance for painting all the traffic markings is a large figure, therefore he is trying to minimize the annual maintenance and make it something that will last several years. Mr. Seeds questioned if it would be cheaper, in the long run, to install the thermoplastic crosswalks. Mr. Fleming answered that it will last longer.

Mr. Hawk noted if you can get these items worked out and get the approval for the plan, you may have helped the 2011 budget for Lower Paxton Township since the Township will see building coming back, to include transfer fees and permit fees.

Mr. Seeds questioned when the traffic signal at Fairmont Drive and Locust Lane will be installed. Mr. Engle noted that it is tied into future phases. Mr. Troutman noted that it would be spelled out in the Developer's Agreement. Mr. Seeds questioned if the Developer's Agreement would be ready for Tuesday night's meeting. Mr. Engle answered that it would be a condition of the plan that it must be completed. Mr. Troutman noted that the traffic signal application would

be submitted in the Township's name and it would be completed as part of Phase Two. Mr. Troutman noted that the developer cannot install the traffic signal until he has started the actual development since it is installing the traffic signal as a favor to the Township. Mr. Hawk questioned if there will be a lot of earth moving. Mr. Troutman answered yes, noting that the first phase will be challenging since they have to build the road and divert the traffic on the existing road to the new road in order to get anything done.

Mr. Hawk suggested that this TND will be the envy of many of the TNDs in the area. Mr. Troutman noted that none of the TNDs in the area have a commercial area within it. Mr. Engle noted that the architectural standards will exceed what has been done in other TNDs. Mr. Troutman noted that he wanted to make sure that we could agree on all the conditions before next Tuesday's meeting.

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 8:34 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman
Township Secretary