

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop Meeting held January 10, 2012

A workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6:09 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; Walter Shatto and Douglas Kepler, Koon's Memorial Park Swim Club; Jason Campbell, South Central Emergency Medical Services; Brian Luetchford, Parks and Recreation Director; David Johnson, Public Safety Director; and Watson Fisher and Ted Robinson, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Public Comment

No public comment was presented.

Discussion with Koon's Memorial Park Swim Club regarding
sanitary sewer facilities serving its swimming pools

Mr. Luetchford noted since last summer the Township has been in dialogue with Mr. Kepler and Mr. Shatto in regards to the some difficulties with the Koon's Park pool in regards to discharges from the pool into the stream. He noted, after an extensive investigation, it was found that there were no connections to the public sanitary sewer system, as they were using an on-lot septic system. He noted that the septic tank is full of concrete debris; but the closest sewer connection is a stub from the sewer main that is located at Laporte Street.

Mr. Luetchford explained that he sent a letter to Mr. Kepler on October 28, 2011 explaining the situation, and Mr. Kepler and Mr. Shatto are present to further discuss this matter. He noted that he would also like to discuss the overall condition of the three pools.

Mr. Walter Shatto explained that he had one unusual discharge incident this past summer at the pool. He noted that it occurred after a very hot day in July, with the wading pool, a pool

containing roughly 2,000 gallons of water. He noted that six to seven inches of water are contained in the baby pool and it has its own discharge system versus a much larger filtration systems for the two other pools. He noted that the discharge issue was only subject to that wading pool. He noted that he did not measure the temperature of the water in that pool, but when he stepped into it that evening, it was very hot. He noted that it experienced a chemical imbalance most probably due to the high temperature of the water. He noted that the incident was restricted to the discharge from that pool, noting that the water had a bluish tint when it was discharged into the stream. He noted that he communicated with the paint manufacturer for what was used in that pool, he was given two reasons for the water color change. He explained that the pool was painted a Royal blue color in place of the normal white color. Mr. Luetchford noted that the color in the discharged came from the paint that was used in painting the pool. He noted that the discharges from the pools have always been filtered on the property into the storm drain system into the nearby stream located near Balthaser Street.

Mr. Shatto noted that the discharge result from the backwash efforts of cleaning the pool filters. He noted that it moved some paint particles, on this particular event, resulting in a bluish tint to the discharge waters that entered the storm drain system which was found by Mr. Luetchford and Mr. Robbins. Mr. Kepler noted that due to the hot weather, a chemical unbalance resulted in that particular pool, and to treat it he had to use a lot of chlorine. He noted that one of the items that accelerated the paint and chalking is excessive chlorine. He explained that the water has been discharged into the storm drain for the past 51 years, and they have created a huge cement basin where the backwash water empties into the storm sewer system. He noted that the bluish tint raised questions as to what was going on and what the pool system was discharging into the stream. He noted that everyone was alerted to the bluish discharge to the stream.

Mr. Shatto noted that it was suggested that the discharges be made into the sanitary sewer system. He noted to maintain a corrective action; he discharged the backwash into the sanitary waste by use of a five inch fire hose that was placed into a sanitary sewer manhole. He noted that Authority personnel assisted in this effort, but it was suggested that the pool should be connected to the Township sanitary sewer system.

Mr. Wolfe noted that it was the Township's understanding that the pool was designed to discharge into a stream, however, the current Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) regulations under a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit acquired and enforced by the Township, does not allow public pools to discharge into a stream. Mr. Kepler noted that he was unable to find anyone from the Township who could provide him with these regulations. Mr. Shatto questioned if the pool would be cited for a violation. Mr. Wolfe noted that technically, the Township would be the entity cited as it would fall under its permit. He noted that the Township was given a permit by DEP that states that municipal storm water must be treated and discharged in a certain way and the Township is required to enforce these regulations. He noted that the Township would issue a citation, however, it is not going to do that at this time and that is why the Authority Department assisted two to three times a week to discharge the backwashed waters into the sanitary sewer. He noted that it was only a temporary solution to the problem and there is a need for a permanent solution for this problem.

Mr. Luetchford read from a DEP general inspection report that stated that backwash from filters and lowering levels in pool cannot directly enter surface water. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Kepler was not speaking to the correct people as the MS4 Inspector for the Township is Matt Miller. Mr. Luetchford noted that a representative from DEP inspected the site on September 8, 2011 and made the above mentioned findings in his report. Mr. Wolfe made a copy of the report and provided it to Mr. Kepler. Mr. Luetchford noted that the report suggests that the water could be discharged over the ground surface, but he suggested that was only for the small 2,000 gallon wading pool. He questioned if the main pools also discharge into the streams. Mr. Kepler answered that they do. Mr. Kepler noted that they only back flush the filters and they do not empty the pool.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the pool needs a NPDES permit. Mr. Luetchford explained, after discussing the situation with Matt Miller and Sam Robbins last fall, he noted that there are three options, and all three indicate discharging the water into the sanitary sewer system noting that it would not be possible to backwash that volume of water for all three pools onto the ground surface. He noted that a lateral could be installed by a contractor hired by the pool; the Authority could do the installation as part of the mini-basin contract; and the I&I rehab crew could install a

line. He noted that he spoke with Mr. Hilson and Mr. Weaver and they suggested that there are two options noting that it is not an easy connection to make. He noted that there is a lateral stub off of Laporte Street that the pool could be connected to. Mr. Hawk questioned if the pool needs a permit. Mr. Luetchford noted that they need to comply with DEP regulations. Mr. Hawk questioned if they would need engineering and construction work. Mr. Seeds noted that they do not need a permit for the sanitary connection work. Mr. Stine noted that they would need a sanitary sewer connection permit. Mr. Wolfe noted that he did not know where Penn Colonial Pool's water is dumped, however, Devon Manor Pool only dumps their backwash water once a year and the Authority has worked with them to get it into the sanitary sewer system. Mr. Shatto questioned if they only backwash their system once a year. Mr. Wolfe noted that they only dump water into the stream once a year. Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Shatto is he has a sand filter or Diatomaceous Earth (DE) filter. Mr. Shatto answered that they use a sand filtering system.

Mr. Seeds questioned if all the three pools are backwashed. Mr. Shatto answered yes, noting that the water ends up in the stream for all three. He noted that they have discharged across the land mass in the park but it makes the ball field below the pool wet. Mr. Luetchford noted that DEP will either stop them from operating the pool if they can't change things or provide them with a pass and continue to operate in some fashion noting that they must improve the situation. He questioned if Koons Pool can afford to do anything, whether discharging across a surface, or dealing with another type of re-piping, or rerouting of the sanitary sewer. He noted that all of these items cost money to do and DEP will want them to do something sooner or later. He noted that Mr. Shatto and Mr. Kepler are requesting Township assistance. Mr. Kepler noted that the pool co-owns the property with the Township. He noted that he and Mr. Shatto are volunteers and without their help the pool would fail to operate. He noted to come up with this much money or energy to solve this issue is beyond the scope of the organization.

Mr. Seeds suggested that there is a problem with the sanitary on-lot system. Mr. Kepler noted when he opened the septic tank, he found parts of cement benches, but it is not full. He is not sure how they got in their but it was done many years ago. He noted that they could be removed from the tank, but the septic system works fine. He noted that the backwash water is too much to put into that septic system. Mr. Kepler noted that the septic system has been working fine for what it was designed to do.

Mr. Hawk noted that the pool needs to take some corrective action. Mr. Kepler stated that he has documents showing that the paint had no environmental impact. Mr. Shatto questioned if he had to make corrections before he heard about the DEP report. He noted that the water discharge was not toxic, noting that the paint manufacturer has provided documents to state that... Mr. Stine noted that the problem is with the chlorine in the water as it is going into a stream and it impacts aquatic life. He noted that it is not the paint, as DEP doesn't care about the paint; it is the chlorine in the water. Mr. Shatto noted that it is discharged directly into the water. He noted if it is discharged over ground mass, chlorine dissipates. He noted that he pumps thousands of gallons of chlorine into those pools over a month's time but if he turned it off, it dissipates from the water within a number of hours. Mr. Luetchford noted that DEP allows residents to discharge backwash water over the surface in small amounts but they don't allow it for commercial pools. He noted that Mr. Robbins was very clear that we must make a sanitary sewer connection, but Mr. Shatto does not agree with that. Mr. Shatto noted that he would like to know what the other pools are doing in the area before a decision is made for Koon's Pool. He noted that once a year is not enough of a filtration backwash. Mr. Crissman suggested that you may be talking about two different systems, noting that you are talking about a sand filter, whereas the other pools may have a DE system. Mr. Wolfe noted that Penn Colonial Pool is a DE system. Mr. Crissman noted that the process is different for filtration systems and how they are purged.

Mr. Kepler noted that they either back wash out over the local surface area which will cause problems for the ball fields or the water will have to be pumped somewhere else. He noted that the temporary solution of stopping traffic and having the Township open a manhole to run the fire hoses is an arduous task. He noted that it looks like the pool needs to tie into the sanitary sewer system. Mr. Hawk noted that something needs to be done. He noted to offer technical support from the Township is one thing but to ask the Township to pay for it is a budgetary problem. Mr. Kepler noted that it is one for both of them. Mr. Hawk noted that the Board imposed a tax increase this year and has maxed out where it can get its money.

Mr. Blain questioned how much it would cost to tie into the sanitary sewer system. Mr. Luetchford noted when he spoke to Mr. Weaver and Mr. Hilson and they indicated if they did it between now before the beginning of summer, outside of the mini-basin contract, they would

have to use Ronca to do the work on a time and material basis and it would be very expensive, costing in the range of \$60,000 to \$70,000. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would fall under the emergency contract which is time and materials. He noted if it was part of the mini-basin project, it would cost around \$15,000. He noted that the contract is going to bid in one month and the work will be ongoing over two years but the possibility that the work could be done before the pool opens the end of May are slim. Mr. Seeds questioned if the contractor could do that work first. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township does not direct the work of the contractor; they do it at their own scheduling. He noted that the Township could request that the contractor do that work first, but that is all it could do. Mr. Seeds suggested if the line was installed for the back wash issue then they might as well hook up to the sanitary sewer system. Mr. Wolfe explained that staff is not looking to solve this issue tonight; rather it is looking to see if the Board is willing to participate in the solution. He noted if the Board's direction is that the Township or Authority would not participate in this, then there is nothing more for it to do, however if it should be included into the mini-basin work and absorb the cost, then he needs to see what he can do as far as scheduling. Mr. Hawk noted that it comes down to the cost, plus or minus \$15,000 is one thing, but \$75,000 is entirely a different matter. Mr. Kepler noted that the Pool could not afford to pay \$15,000 and it would mean closing it. He noted that he has shared the budgets and balance sheets with the Board members in the past but there is no way they could spend that amount of money to fix the problem. He explained that he had a balance of a few thousand dollars at the end of the year and they are continuing to pay off the debt. Mr. Crissman noted that the Township has helped the pool with the debt. Mr. Kepler agreed with Mr. Crissman, but explained that the pool is just making ends meet, and there is no way to secure those funds. He explained that a few volunteers have managed to keep the operations going, but this may mean the end of the pool.

Mr. Seeds noted if the work was included in the mini-basin contract this spring, he questioned if DEP would buy into the fact that the work would be done eventually. Mr. Luetchford noted that he could negotiate with DEP noting that they have a variety of concerns regarding this mini-basin contract. He noted that he could look to see how they could juggle this work and what priority DEP would give to this project, if the Board is interested in participating in the process. Mr. Shatto suggested that he has a temporary measure of discharging the water as

ground water across the ground surface. Mr. Luetchford suggested that it may cause more problems down hill. Mr. Hawk noted that we need to get a price for the work and to determine how soon the work could be done. Mr. Kepler explained that he has no source of funding for this cost.

Mr. Wolfe explained that the entire environment in terms of stormwater is changing dramatically in Pennsylvania and up until recently the Township's involvement was only in regards to the amount of flow and not environmental quality. He noted with the recent changes in State regulations, the Township must now enforce State requirements for environmental quality under the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) program. He noted that the Township is given a NPDES permit and as long as it is in compliance with it for the stormwater system that is fine, however, if it violates the permit there are ramifications including penalties. He noted that Swatara Township recently was cited for a NPDES violation on a private parking lot, and as a result the municipality was fined. He noted that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) found that the municipality should have taken corrective action and it did not. He noted that the fine was significant. He noted what was done years ago is not permitted now.

Mr. Shatto questioned if any pool discharges are permitted through the sanitary waste. Mr. Wolfe answered that Devon Manor does when they dump the water from their pool in the spring, noting that it is pumped into the sanitary sewer system in a clean out that is located in their parking lot. He noted that he does not know what Penn Colonial Pool does. He noted in the past they had their entire system pumped out by Honey Dippers.

Mr. Seeds noted that the DEP letter states that it appears that there is a sanitary sewer connection. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Authority has not been able to find one as they die tested the entire facility. He noted that there is a lateral but no building sewer. Mr. Kepler noted that the lateral that comes from the street is not connected as it was not needed years ago as they had an operating septic system. Mr. Seeds stated that we do not know that. He noted that the Authority is replacing many deficit sewers for I&I and this may be a repair job. Mr. Kepler noted that they tried to find a pipe and couldn't. Mr. Crissman noted that no pipe could be found. Mr. Luetchford stated that the dye test proved that the on-lot septic system was working and there was no connection anywhere else. Mr. Shatto noted that there is only a stub for a connection but they have not been able to determine if it is connected.

Mr. Shatto questioned if the pool pumps their back wash water into the sanitary sewer system, would it have to take measures to reduce the chlorine as it may have an effect on the filtration process. Mr. Wolfe answered that all the sewage in that area goes to the Beaver Creek Treatment Plant in Swatara Township, with flows in excess of millions of gallons per day. Mr. Stine noted that by the time the chlorine reaches the plant it would be undetectable.

Mr. Kepler noted that there are two problems: the first is the lack of funds on the part of the pool or the Township to connect to the sanitary sewer system, and what should be done in the meantime. He noted that he would love to open the pool this spring. Mr. Hawk noted that the organization cannot open the pool unless something is done and he needs to know what needs to be done and if the Board is willing to pick up the tab. Mr. Seeds noted that the Township owns the land where the pool is located and virtually owns the pool. He noted that the staff of the pool would be able to open the pool under normal circumstances.

Mr. Kepler explained, with Mr. Shatto's assistance, and the contracts with the local daycare centers, it has become a viable operation, but it does not generate the dollars that are needed to make those types of repairs. Mr. Shatto noted that they are sustaining an operational level of income. Mr. Crissman noted that the Board does not have the money nor was it budgeted for \$60,000 to open the pool. Mr. Hawk noted that he is not opposed to spending some money to determine the logical solution and then discuss if the Township can afford to help.

Mr. Luetchford questioned if it would be permissible for staff to investigate the options to search for a low cost option for the pool to operate this summer and summers to follow. Mr. Hawk questioned when the pool would open. Mr. Kepler noted that it would open Memorial Day weekend; however staff is busy preparing the pool during the month of April. He noted that he has six sub-contracts for pool memberships that he has put on hold for the daycare centers noting that he needs to know what to do about this.

Mr. Hawk questioned how hard it would be to find a solution to the problem. Mr. Kepler noted that he needs that to occur as soon as possible. Mr. Luetchford noted that he would discuss this with Mr. Robbins and DEP. Mr. Hawk noted that the question is how fast we could do this. Mr. Luetchford noted that he would try to see where these discussions go and how fast DEP responds to their inquiries. Mr. Crissman noted since DEP would be the agency to cite the Township, they should provide the direction for moving forward, and then the Board could

determine what it would cost. He noted the violation would be to discharge the waters into the stream, and DEP should be able to provide direction to the Township. He noted, if the final costs are \$60,000, the pool will not open in June.

Mr. Kepler noted if DEP informs the Township that it must dump the water into the Sanitary Sewer system, and it is assumed that there is no pipe connection to the sanitary sewer, then they would have to install a line. Mr. Seeds noted that we need to know if the existing sewer should be replaced or if a new connection could be made under the new contract. He questioned if we could buy some time since it might take up to two years to get it done. Mr. Crissman questioned what the pool would do in the meantime until that connection is made. He noted that DEP stated that the pool was in violation now, so what would change their position to permit this to go on for another two years. Mr. Kepler suggested that it would not be illegal to dump the water on the grass, noting that it would provide for a wet ballfield. Mr. Crissman noted that he would need to know that DEP would approve that. Mr. Luetchford suggested that it only covered the wading pool and this would have to be decided by DEP.

Mr. Seeds noted that he would like to see this as the part of the sewer contract at the most reasonable cost possible. Mr. Crissman noted that DEP would have to provide its blessing for this. Mr. Seeds questioned if the Board could tell DEP that they will fix it and ask if they could discharge the water onto the grass in the meantime until the contractor installs a connection. Mr. Luetchford noted that he would look into this. Mr. Kepler noted if the pool discharges the water over the grass surface, the baseball association would lose use of the one small baseball field.

Review of the Friendship Center operations audit prepared by Ballard King

Mr. Luetchford noted that Ballard King completed an audit last summer for the Friendship Center (FC). He noted that Mr. Ballard assisted with the initial design of the FC and two subsequent audits. He noted that he prepared an analysis of the operations of the facility, providing various recommendations and they were divided into key recommendations and other recommendations.

Mr. Luetchford noted that staff reviewed and organized the key recommendations from the audit. He noted that the Friendship Center Operating Board (FCOB) reviewed them and the responsibility for the items has been listed in the documents prepared by staff. He noted that the

recommendations were broken down into the FCOB, Administrative Staff, Marketing Staff, Programming Staff, and Facility Staff to tackle in the coming years. He noted they are prioritizing the recommendations to determine what year they should be tackled.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the FCOB requested staff to provide what they could do in the coming years and 15 items were listed. He noted that they have compiled the top six most important projects that they want to work on first in the first six months of this year at their December meeting. He noted that they are as follows: 1) request payment for FC operations costs from senior citizens; 2) develop a five-year prioritized Capital Improvement Plan; 2) Establish a Parks and Recreation Foundation and determine if the Foundation should be contracted to operate the FC; 4) Compose a plan for the Fitness Center to expand into the Social Hall; 5) Consider selling advertising/naming rights within the FC; and 6) update the locker rooms by eliminating the key lock system, replace lockers, upgrade finishes, and replace mirrors. He noted that there are many other items that staff will work on. He noted that one recommendation was completed with finding the replacement for the renting of the west annex with Drayer Therapies replacing Pinnacle Health.

Mr. Hawk questioned what the thought was for establishing a foundation to run the FC. Mr. Luetchford answered that this has been an off and on discussion, noting that the Township currently owns and operates the FC; operating with union contracts associated with running the facility, and there are costs that are done efficiently but some that the Township can not do as efficiently. He noted that Mr. Ballard has found situations where Foundations or Authorities have been set up to run the operations if it is found that they can do so much more efficiently. He noted that a 501 C Organization would be the best way to accept donations by individuals or corporations, and that would be another reason to establish a foundation. He noted that the Parks and Recreation Board, Greenway Committee and Arts Council have also had similar discussions noting that they are concerned with the current budget conditions, thinking that they may need to go out to corporations or individuals to accept donations. He noted that a way to do that would be to set up a 501 C Organization for the "Friends of the Parks" that could represent all those various boards. Mr. Hawk questioned if this would allow the FC to maintain its status as an enterprise fund, making the rules with the Township paying for it. Mr. Luetchford explained that there is a variety of ways to set this up. Mr. Seeds noted that the foundation could run the FC at

reduced costs. He noted that there are a lot of things that they could do that we could not do and he suggested that there already was a foundation for the FC.

Mr. Seeds noted that the Board has discussed the option of requesting payment from the seniors for some time.

Mr. Blain questioned how Mr. Luetchford planned to approach the seniors for payment for the use of the facility. Mr. Luetchford noted that the seniors are requesting more use of free space so it will open the dialogue for this. He noted that he hopes to have a frank discussion with them on this topic very soon.

Mr. Crissman explained that the model for the process for the FCOB to tackle these issues for its next agenda will be to identify the issue, what is the ultimate goal, and what the action plan will be. He noted that the FCOB will have to lobby Rep. Ron Marsico and the Dauphin County Commissioner, and write letters to get help on this and then bring a recommendation back to the Board of Supervisors. He noted that an option may be to find a corporate sponsor to offset the costs if Dauphin County states they have no money to fund the senior center.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the fitness center was expanded into the social hall, would it still provide enough for the two pool tables. Mr. Luetchford answered that the social hall is a great community center but it is not the most efficient use of space and means to gain income. He noted that moving the glass wall ten feet further into the fitness center to provide more room for that location and less room for the social hall is a possible consideration. He noted that the fitness center is the single most efficient revenue center, and the reasoning is if you expand the best revenue center you can make yourself more efficient. He noted that the social hall does not bring in income, other than selling a few drinks. Mr. Seeds noted that the social hall is used, maybe four or fives times a year for the annual anniversary ceremony, tree lighting, and other such events. Mr. Luetchford noted that it is crucial to have those areas that are generating money. Mr. Seeds noted that it bothered him when he read it. Mr. Crissman noted that is the kind of data that has to be collected when the FCOB begins to discuss that issue.

Mr. Blain questioned how you can allow naming rights when it is a Township-owned facility. Mr. Luetchford noted that there are situations in municipal areas where they sell advertising for the parks system, noting that it is normally operated by a foundation and naming

various areas are done regularly. Mr. Crissman explained that they tried to exclude that in the Central Dauphin School District but eventually it occurred when Coke Cola sponsored the scoreboard. He noted that it has been the past tradition with the Parks and Recreation Board not to permit advertising. He further stated that this would be part of the discussion for the FCOB since it would have implications to other Township Boards.

Mr. Seeds noted that 15 years ago you would never see advertising in schools or playgrounds, but now you do. Mr. Blain noted that Paxtonia is a Township Park and it has outfield fencing advertisements. Mr. Luetchford noted that it is a leased property from the School District, but it is not allowed in the other Township parks. Mr. Crissman noted, when he worked for the Central Dauphin School District, and the land was rented at Paxtonia to the Township, it was part of the agreement that they could do that. Mr. Blain questioned if the Township has told other organizations such as the Capital Area Soccer Association (CASA) that they could not advertise. Mr. Luetchford noted that the most that has been allowed to date is to have a company sponsor a teener field at Koons Park with a sign stating that it was sponsored by a certain organization in block letters with no logos. He noted that the Parks and Recreation Board has discussed this numerous times and refused to agree to advertising. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Blain was referring to was a discussion when CASA wanted to allow naming rights to fund a turf field at a park; however, they were told that the current policy at that time was that the Township did not permit naming rights in Township parks. He noted that it was and currently is the Township's policy. He noted that Ballard suggested that the Township is missing the boat on funding with this policy. Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Ballard stated that it has been a revenue generating use for parks and the Township may want to take it under consideration. He noted that the recommendation may come back to the Board that it does not want to do it.

Mr. Hawk noted that the Township paid Mr. Ballard good money to make these recommendations but he did not know how many could be done at one time. Mr. Crissman explained that these considerations were given to the FCOB to consider for making recommendation to the Board of Supervisors for each item. He noted if the FCOB did not respond to the recommendations, it would not be doing its job. Mr. Luetchford explained that the FCOB will be in communication with the Board of Supervisors from this point forward to make recommendations for the FC.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the plan for the locker rooms is to do away with key lockers and allow people to bring their own locks. He questioned if the FCOB has discussed the pros and cons for this. Mr. Crissman noted that the FCOB has not discussed any of the 15 items, they have only prioritized the top six items to deal with over the next six months, taking one item at a time. He noted that no discussion has been held on the individual recommendations. Mr. Luetchford noted that he is only present to show the Board of Supervisors what the FCOB intends to do in the future. Mr. Seeds noted that he would reserve his comment until the FCOB makes their recommendations. He noted that he thought decisions had been made for some of the recommendations. Mr. Crissman noted that no action has been planned for any of the issues. He noted that Mr. Luetchford is only sharing the progress report and what has occurred thus far.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the FCOB will be in conversation with the Parks and Recreation Board, Greenway Committee, and Arts Council about the concept for a Foundation.

Mr. Seeds noted when he read the Ballard Report there was an item that was not on the list, a pool ultraviolet system. He questioned if it would be looked at. Mr. Luetchford answered yes. Mr. Seeds noted that the outfall to the sanitary sewer system was also listed and a recommendation with doing away with the outdoor pool area and making a spray area in that space. He noted that partnering out ideas and websites was also mentioned. He questioned if he took his laptop to the FC would he be able to connect to the internet. Mr. Luetchford answered, not at this time; however, it has to be looked at again.

Mr. Seeds noted that somewhere in the report it stated that the FC opened in February of 2000 but it was really January of 2000. He suggested that all the items should be addressed by the FCOB. Mr. Crissman answered that they will be, however, Mr. Luetchford is only present to share the entire report and he further explained that no one has responded to any of the issues. Mr. Luetchford suggested that Mr. Seeds review the Key Recommendation spreadsheet. He noted for the most part everything has a designation. Mr. Seeds questioned if those items were missed as they are not on the list. Mr. Luetchford noted that those items will be considered by the FCOB.

Review of the proposed Capital Replacement Plan for the Friendship
Center that has been prepared by staff

Mr. Wolfe explained that he prepared a Friendship Center Capital Replacement Plan (FCCRP) for operations. He noted that this was begun prior to the completion of the Ballard Report. He noted that Mr. Luetchford has provided him a complete list of all equipment and items within the FC that have a total initial cost of \$2,500 or more and will need to be replaced at some time over a 20-year life span. He noted that they were listed on a depreciation schedule based upon experience of 12 years of occupancy. He noted that he has created the following replacement plan:

	Estimate of 2011 Replacement costs	Specific Depreciation based upon current Exp.	Estimated Annual Exp. Based upon Depreciation Schedule
<u>5-YEAR DEPRECIATION:</u>			
Fitness Center cardio equipment (21)	\$ 92,500.00	4 years	
Leisure Pool Filter Pump	\$ 5,000.00	5 years	
Total for 5-year depreciation items:	\$ 97,500.00	÷ 5 =	\$ 19,500.00
<u>7.5-YEAR DEPRECIATION:</u>			
Fitness Center cardio equipment (11)	\$ 55,000.00	8 years	
Lap pool filter pump	\$ 5,000.00	6 years	
Spin bicycles (18)	\$ 16,200.00	8 years	
Office copier/printer/fax	\$ 11,000.00	6 years	
Life Fitness weight machines	\$ 42,000.00	8 years	
Carpet (social hall, fit. cntr., hallways)	\$ 25,000.00	8 years	
Total for 7.5-year depreciation items:	\$ 154,200.00	÷ 7.5 =	\$ 20,560.00
<u>10-YEAR DEPRECIATION:</u>			
Seal and stripe parking lot	\$ 7,000.00	10 years	
Office carpet	\$ 10,000.00	10 years	
Fitness Center cardio equipment (4)	\$ 5,000.00	10 years	
Total for 10-year depreciation items:	\$ 22,000.00	÷ 10 =	\$ 2,200.00
<u>12.5-YEAR DEPRECIATION:</u>			
Gymnasium curtains (3)	\$ 36,000.00	12 years	
Replaster Lap Pool shell	\$ 18,800.00	12 years	
Billiard Tables (2)	\$ 5,000.00	12 years	
Leisure Pool water features	\$ 8,000.00	12 years	
Johnson Controls (bldg HVAC mgt)	\$ 80,000.00	12 years	

Social Hall furniture	\$ 4,000.00	13 years	
Pool Pak HVAC (unit 2)	\$ 305,000.00	13 years	
Pool Pak HVAC (unit 1)	\$ 305,000.00	13 years	
Exterior natatorium doors (8)	\$ 7,000.00	13 years	
Fitness Center supplemental weight equip (white)	\$ 24,000.00	13 years	
Total for 12.5-year depreciation items:	\$ 792,800.00	÷ 12.5 =	\$ 63,424.00

15-YEAR DEPRECIATION:

Locker Room HVAC units (2)	\$ 100,000.00	14 years	
Fitness Center dumbbell equipment	\$ 8,000.00	14 years	
Natatorium bleachers	\$ 15,000.00	14 years	
Rooftop HVAC units (9)	\$ 360,000.00	15 years	
RayPac boiler (spa)	\$ 9,000.00	15 years	
Ceiling tile (vending, locker, multi-purpose, etc.)	\$ 23,700.00	15 years	
Patio re-leveling, replace benches, cans, bike racks	\$ 8,000.00	15 years	
Fitness Center supplemental equip (3)	\$ 9,000.00	15 years	
Total for 15-year depreciation items:	\$ 532,700.00	÷ 15 =	\$ 35,513.00

20-YEAR DEPRECIATION:

Telephone system	\$ 30,000.00	20 years	
Mens, womens, and family lockers (352)	\$ 50,000.00	15 years	
Roof Replacement (replace EPDM)	\$ 435,000.00	20 years	
Total for 20-year depreciation items:	\$ 515,000.00	÷ 20 =	\$ 25,750.00

Total for all depreciation items:	\$ 2,114,200.00		\$ 166,947.00
--	------------------------	--	----------------------

Mr. Wolfe noted that the \$166,947.00 is not funded by the FCCRP. He noted that a FCCRP has been drafted and presented once to the FCOB, but they have yet to act on it because they have been entertaining the Ballard Report and dealing with the budget. He noted that the FCOB will be considering this item in the upcoming months.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the FCCRP established priorities, and there is the realization that the capital facilities will become obsolete and fail and need to be replaced based upon efficiencies alone. He noted that the purpose of the plan is to quantify the overall costs of systems and equipment and then determine an annual allocation that should be made to a capital replacement fund.

Mr. Wolfe noted the bottom of page one lists the existing capital reserve fund. He noted that it was set up in accordance with the Second Class Township Code, which means the money in the fund can only be used for its intended purpose and it would take a unanimous vote of the Board to change the fund. Mr. Stine noted that he was not sure about that and would have to research it. Mr. Seeds suggested that the capital reserve fund is arbitrary. Mr. Wolfe explained when the capital reserve fund was set up; it was not defined very well. He noted that the capital reserve fund did not define future capital needs. He noted to some it may be existing equipment and systems, and to other it means additions to the FC. He noted in setting up the fund by resolution it was not defined and both of those items would be permissible. He explained that he is not sure how to go about clearing up the confusion for the expending of those funds except to correct it moving forward.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there were certain assumptions when preparing the draft of \$2,500 or more and providing for only existing systems and equipment and not for a future addition to the building. He noted that it was created as a 20-year life cycle, and the plan was based upon 2011 dollars, included a depreciation based upon the expected useful life with a recommendation that the plan be revisited on an annual basis and adjusted for inflation.

Mr. Wolfe noted page three shows the life cycle periods and how they were determined was decided. He noted that the current annual cost to fund the plan is \$166,947. He proposed, at staff level, an implementation procedure, whereby for 2012 there would be no deposit into the capital fund for the annual commitment of \$170,000. He noted that it would be taken from the existing capital reserve fund and a portion of the operating fund to balance. He noted that it would get the plan through most of 2012, requiring a \$30,000 deposit in 2013 to fully fund the capital reserve fund. He noted in 2014, the FC would be in a position to fund on an annual basis, the capital reserve fund at its full amount of \$166,947. He noted that given the current funds on hand, the FC can develop a program to generate sufficient revenue over the next two years that by 2014, the annual allocation will be available for that fund.

Mr. Wolfe noted that it is a plan that is based upon a need to general additional revenue in a facility that is having a hard time breaking even. He noted, at the end of 2021, the debt service for the FC ends, and a total of \$380,000 annually becomes available to the operation of the FC to fund capital improvements.

Mr. Wolfe noted that it was his intention to review the draft plan with the Board, take its comments back and further discuss this with the FCOB, and then bring it back in final form for final discussions.

Mr. Seeds noted that Resolution 11 is mentioned.... Mr. Wolfe explained that it is the proposed resolution to adopt the plan. Mr. Seeds noted that he did not fully understand the draft plan. He questioned if there is \$300,000 in the account at this time. Mr. Wolfe noted that amount was based upon a mid-year number from 2011 but he does not know what the year-end numbers are at this time. Mr. Seeds noted for 2012, the Board would take \$177,000 and remove it from the \$310,000 and put it in another fund. Mr. Wolfe noted that you would leave it in that fund as part of the fund, but further define that fund for existing capital facilities. Mr. Seeds noted in 2013, the Board would need to add another \$30,000 to that fund. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would have to be funded by additional revenues from earned revenues and transfer operating funds. He noted that the FC has excess operating funds on account. He noted when you have refinanced or refunded bonds, you take the savings in a lump sum in the year that you did the refunding and put it in the operating fund balance. He noted that there are operating fund revenues greater than what is due as a result of the bond refunding. Mr. Seeds questioned if there is a possibility of refunding bonds again. Mr. Wolfe noted that staff is discussing that as a possible option.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the big nut to crack will be in 2014, having a program that will generate an additional \$170,000 a year in revenues to fund the capital needs. Mr. Crissman noted that the difficult time period will be getting from 2014 to 2021, the time when the debt will be paid off. Mr. Seeds noted if there is a refinancing or extra borrowing it could extend the time period for the mortgage.

Mr. Seeds noted that he has been against replacing existing equipment with the capital fund, noting that it should be for an addition to the building. He noted that the budget is tight and he has no answer for where the FC could come up with those funds. Mr. Wolfe explained that the interpretation of what would be vested is with the elected officials who created the fund. Mr. Seeds noted that it is a very difficult part. Mr. Wolfe suggested that you have to maintain your facility before saving for an addition. He noted if you can't keep the doors open for the existing place, what good is it to set aside money to build a new place. Mr. Seeds noted if you move the wall between the social hall and the fitness center that would be a just use of the money. He

noted buying a new treadmill should not be funded by the capital fund. Mr. Seeds noted in the 20-year scenario, almost everything was included but he did not see any funds for a roof. Mr. Wolfe noted that it was the last item at \$20,000.

Mr. Wolfe noted that staff is not in a position where action is needed on this plan; however, it came up as a Ballard recommendation, and we need to recognize the capital needs and replacement costs are. He noted that during the initial building, the capital improvements were not taken into consideration as to how to fund it. He noted with a building that is now 12 years old, and having experienced the replacement of some items, it is now time to plan how we will do it and recognize the cost on an annual basis.

Mr. Crissman noted that we need to plan for the future and he does not want to play defense.

Mr. Seeds questioned in order to raise \$166,000 annually, how much would staff have to increase memberships. Mr. Wolfe answered that annual and monthly memberships generate \$1.1 million, roughly 15% of that amount. He noted that the FC is not in the market where there is much elasticity. Mr. Seeds noted that some of it could come from program increases. Mr. Luetchford explained that he regularly increases the costs for programs. Mr. Crissman noted that you can't add more programs since staff will tell you that there is no more room for additional programs at the facility. Mr. Wolfe noted that we can generate a lot of revenue with programs and they are very popular; however, there is not enough building to do more. Mr. Crissman noted that there has been discussions for satellite programs to other locations as it generate revenue. He noted when the FCOB discusses the use of the social hall; he will note that they will have to find other ways to resolve those issues. He noted that he is happy that staff is being proactive and looking at it now, and not waiting until 2014 and then questioning what to do.

Mr. Seeds noted that the fitness center was very busy after the first of the year with all the people who made New Year resolutions to work out. He noted that he normally never has a problem waiting for a machine. Mr. Wolfe noted that the FC experienced a problem earlier in 2011 when two less treadmills were in operation and two more were out of order, but with the leasing of equipment this year, we now have 13 units that are operational and he has not see one down for any period of time yet. He noted that leasing seems to fill the demand. Mr. Crissman noted that timing is crucial for how busy the fitness center is for any given time. Mr. Seeds noted

that he normally goes to work out between 4 p.m. and 5 p.m. and he works to and suggested that is the busiest time.

Review of a proposed amendment to the fee-in-lieu of land dedication provisions in the Draft Recreation and Park Plan

Mr. Wolfe explained when the Board addressed the Laurel Ridge Plan and attempted to implement the revised Subdivision and Land Development Plan (SALDO) for recreation fee-in-lieu; there was a problem in the format of the ordinance and the interpretation of the plan. He noted that staff has taken those discussions and proposed amendments to the draft plan and also to the SALDO. He noted that the plan is attached but he suggested moving to the proposed amendment which has been prepared by Mr. Luetchford. He noted that Mr. Luetchford will explain what he proposes to change.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the plan has been around in various draft forms for many years. He noted that several years ago he conducted a survey on various municipalities for their park systems. He noted that it is included as an attachment to this plan. He noted that it is important that the Recreation and Parks Plan (R&P Plan) has a direct connection to the SALDO. He noted that. Normally, there is a certain square footage for land dedication, but he questioned if the Board would require the developers to take on the full expansion of the park system. He noted that the plan states that there is a certain number of acres needed in order to fulfill the 12 acres per 1,000 person requirement and he questioned what part of this the developers would fulfill. He noted that the R&P Plan calls for more square footage than what is included in the SALDO, 2,000 square feet per dwelling unit, whereas the current SALDO is only asking for 1,800 square feet per dwelling unit. He noted that the intention is not to have the SALDO place the responsibility to provide all the land on the developers to fulfill the R&P Plan requirements for future parkland. He noted that a residential requirement is a partial solution but not a complete solution to the situation. He explained if the Township asks for 1,800 square feet it will only get about 55% of the need from the developers if the vast majority of developers provide land. He noted that some of the projects are under 50 units and the suggestion is to take a fee-in-lieu for those projects as the amount of land would only be roughly two acres. He recommended accepting the land from the larger developments since land will only be available for so long.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the document explains how the development will work. He noted that it is estimated that only 30% of the developers will pay fees with the remaining 70% paying in land since the SALDO will now enforce the Township's decision to accept land over fees. He noted with the shortage of available land the emphasis is now on land. He noted that developers may provide 84 acres toward the overall need of 150 acres as we reach the year 2020 with an estimated population of 54,000 people. He noted that the fee-in-lieu funds, historically, have not been able to keep pace with land and those fees could not have paid for the same land that would have been donated as part of the R&P Plan. He noted that there are suggested changes to the R&R Plan.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the R&P Plan has been reviewed by the Parks and Recreation Board and has been recommended for approval by the Board of Supervisors to support the SALDO to enforce fee-in-lieu or land dedication. Mr. Hawk suggested that it is switching the emphasis. Mr. Luetchford noted that the SALDO states that we must have a R&P Plan; specifically, to be able to implement this land dedication or fee-in-lieu.

Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Luetchford what objections, if any, do you see coming from developers who will face these regulations. Mr. Luetchford answered that there should not be as many objections as in the past, noting that the major concern was if the Township was placing on the backs of the developers the entire expansion for the parks for the future, noting that they feel it should be shared with the Township. He noted this is addressed in the new R&P Plan.

Mr. Seeds noted that the national standard recommends that the developers would be providing 79%, but the national recommended average is more than what the formula dictates. Mr. Luetchford explained, compared to what the Township already has in comparison to what the National Parks Association would like to see, the Township is in between those two. He noted that it is something that the Township could aspire to but 20 acres per 1,000 people would provide for 900 to 1,000 acres of land and we only have 380 acres at this time. He noted that the National Parks Association would like to see between 12 and 20 acres of land per 1,000. Mr. Seeds noted if someone develops a property for 1,000 people, then they should provide between 12 and 20 acres or land or the amount of money to purchase and develop that land. Mr. Luetchford noted that it was simply a guideline from the National Park Association and not a

rule or law that you have to do follow this. He noted that currently the Township provides roughly six acres for 1,000 people. He noted that the thinking of the R&P Board was to have a goal of 12 acres because of the heavy use of the parks and due to the unknown growth rate for the future. He noted that they want to be proactive for park development in the future.

Mr. Seeds questioned what the fee-in-lieu part would be for the requirement. He noted that the suggestion is \$2,800 per unit noting that it is currently \$2,300 per unit. Mr. Wolfe explained that he is not ready to discuss the fee structure yet. Mr. Luetchford noted that there are some sections in bold that staff recommend you approve as well.

Mr. Crissman questioned when the resolution is expected to come before the Board. Mr. Wolfe noted that we have to cover the second part of the requirement which is the fee schedule.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the R&P Plan would be adopted by Resolution, and the SALDO would be an amendment under the Municipalities Planning Code and that may take a couple of months to work through. Mr. Crissman questioned if the Resolution would become effective the day of approval. Mr. Stine noted that it would become effective five days after the enactment. Mr. Crissman questioned if this would impact any plans that are coming to the Board for approval at this time. Mr. Wolfe answered that there is nothing in process at this time.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Luetchford would prefer developers dedicate land over fees. Mr. Luetchford noted that is how the SALDO is set up, noting that the State generally sets up these types of things to accept land. Mr. Hawk noted that the developer could provide 84 acres of the needed 192 acres with the Township making up the remaining 68 acres. Mr. Luetchford noted that he is not expecting the developer to provide all the land for future park expansion. Mr. Hawk noted that the land does not have to be continuous but it has to be close. Mr. Luetchford noted that the land does not have to be directly in a certain location inside a development. He noted that it could be other land that may be more beneficial to the Township; however, it is up to the Township to accept the land, not something that could be forced upon the Township. Mr. Hawk questioned where the Township would get the remaining 68 acres. Mr. Luetchford noted that the Township has leased and received donations of land in the past and it may have other sources for the land.

Mr. Seeds noted that the land has to be suitable.

Mr. Seeds noted, a few years ago Mr. Luetchford conducted a survey of other Townships to determine what their parks looked like. Mr. Luetchford noted that it was conducted four years ago and he researched what the surrounding Township's had and found that Swatara and Susquehanna Townships' had relatively small amounts of land for their population.

Mr. Seeds noted that we also look at their fee-in-lieu requirement. Mr. Luetchford noted that there are a wide variety of formulas. Mr. Seeds suggested that Derry Township was higher. Mr. Luetchford noted that most municipalities were lower. Mr. Wolfe noted, the more eastern locations are close to \$10,000 per lot, and to the west some municipalities have none. Mr. Wolfe noted that you have to have something that is defensible, a plan that makes sense based upon your local conditions, developing a plan to get to the suggested number. Mr. Luetchford noted that he is trying to determine what the build out number may be, and the number of acres per 1,000. Mr. Seeds suggested that it is a \$500 increase from what they had charged five years ago.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would like to prepare the resolution in final form to get the ball rolling on the adoption. Mr. Hawk agreed.

Mr. Luetchford provided a memorandum to Mr. Wolfe, dated January 6, 2012, in regards to a SALDO fee-in-lieu formula. He noted that the Township used a formula in the past that had the recreation requirement of 1,841 square feet per dwelling unit divided by 43,560 square feet which is one acre times the average lot price. He noted that the price of a lot is varied, and he collected this information from the Dauphin County Community Development Agency noting that it also varies in size. He noted that a suggestion was made to consider an average lot price per acre. He noted that the listing from 2010 through 2011 indicated a lot price and size. He noted that many lots that are sold are less than one acre in size, the lot price of a half acre averages \$40,000, therefore the average lot price per acre would be \$80,000. He noted that the average lot price throwing out the very high and very low prices would be almost \$90,000. He noted if you take the price per acre using the same formula you would have \$98,739 average price per acre, an increase of almost \$10,000 per acre. He noted if you multiply that times the development cost factor of .75, it provides the fee-in-lieu payment. He noted, it would come out to \$2,847.80 per dwelling unit using the current fee structure. He noted if you took that and multiplied it by an acre using the same amount without the higher and lower costs you would have \$5,000 per unit, almost doubling the fees. He noted that taking out the higher and lower

costs makes it a much more reasonable price. He noted if you wanted to consider the per-acre pricing it would cost \$5,088.41. He suggested that you could change the development cost factor to a different cost number as it was established well before he or Mr. Wolfe came to work for Lower Paxton Township. Mr. Seeds questioned if the price was for raw land. Mr. Luetchford noted that according to the current SALDO, you would be getting raw land with a certain elevation and contour. He noted that the formula comes out to .0423 acres or 1,841 square feet.

Mr. Crissman thanked Mr. Luetchford for his preparation for all the items covered during this meeting.

Discussion with South Central Emergency Medical Services (SCEMS) regarding its 2011 financial statements, including cash flow, and its 2012 budget

Mr. Wolfe noted that Public Safety Director Johnson and Mr. Jason Campbell, from South Central Emergency Medical Services are present to discuss the information with the Board members.

Mr. Blain questioned Mr. Campbell if there was anything that he wanted to review from his paper work. He questioned if he wanted to provide information on the status of the operations for SCEMS. Mr. Campbell answered that he submitted a proposal this evening to the Executive Board of SCEMS changing the way the organization operates. He noted that they were pretty impressed with his recommendation. He noted that it will not produce any additional expenses or contributions from the Township, but he is looking to increase the number of ambulances from three to seven for daily operations. He noted that he would look to increase the units on the street in the Township within the next three months once the para-transit operations are changed. He explained that it would be an additional expense to the organization. Mr. Seeds questioned if it would entail hiring more employees. Mr. Campbell answered no. Mr. Seeds noted that it would provide for more ambulances. Mr. Campbell stated that was correct. Mr. Blain noted that it should help to increase the revenues as they could answer more calls.

Mr. Campbell noted that the issue is that the para-transit operation is a single use service, a wheel chair van providing service for doctor's appointments, and transportation to and from the hospital. He noted, in many instances, their personnel spend a lot of time waiting for a patient to finish their doctor's appointment. He suggested that it would be much better to take those

employees and put them on an ambulance to handle emergency calls in between transports. He noted that the transit calls have significantly dropped and the employees would be better used if they were staffed in ambulances rather than para-transit operations.

PSD Johnson questioned where those ambulances would be housed. Mr. Campbell answered that they would be housed at station one in the Township. Mr. Campbell explained that he has nine ambulances at this time, four para-transports, and two squads.

Mr. Seeds noted that there are only so many calls in a given time period, and he questioned how it would help. Mr. Campbell noted that he would be using ambulances for para-transports as well as emergencies. He noted that he is already scheduling those providers, so in addition to doing para-transports, they would also handle emergency calls. He noted that they are currently working out of a van, but they can't take emergency calls using vans. He noted if SCEMS is forth or fifth due, other agencies are handling those calls. He noted with this change that will not happen. He noted that there will always be times when there are not enough units to cover all the calls, but putting staff in ambulances would allow them to respond to emergency calls. He noted that they can't do that at this time.

Mr. Campbell stated that he reduced his expenditures. Mr. Hawk noted, in 2010, SCEMS had \$2,300 in the checking account as compared to \$77,000 in 2011. He noted that was a heck of a swing. Mr. Campbell noted at the end of the year 2010 his expenses were reduced by \$1,010 and in 2011, he reduced it by \$436,000. Mr. Blain questioned how Mr. Campbell did that. Mr. Campbell explained that it had nothing to do with operations, but he changed the way administration was operating. He noted that part of the billing was handled by a vendor, but now all bills are vendor out. He noted that he cut back on the uniform expense. He explained that he cut back on the para-transport vans from five to three only having one spare unit. He noted that the para-transports were reduced from ten to five people. Mr. Blain questioned if it impacted any service levels. Mr. Campbell answered that the only service that could have been impacted was the para-transit service. He noted that the revenue was not there and the call volume was very low. He noted that instead of almost breaking even, he could better utilize his people elsewhere.

Mr. Hawk noted that the payroll accounts look good, the savings account look good, and Mr. Campbell is making significant strides. Mr. Campbell noted that he reduced simple things, noting that staff used a folding machine for their fund raising drives, and it cost a lot of money,

so he got rid of it. He noted that nothing changed from the employee's relationship. He noted that some contributions towards benefits were changed. He noted in 2011 he has saved \$406,000. Mr. Blain noted that would explain the increase in the cash position.

Mr. Blain noted that the payables at the end of 2010 were \$75,000 and at the end of November 2011, they were \$7,200. He questioned if he was paying bills faster or were there many delayed payments in that \$74,000 for the prior year. Mr. Campbell answered that there were many delayed payments, noting that he has always been afforded delayed payments for vehicles. He noted a reimbursement does not occur right away, noting that a Medicare payment could take four to six months. He noted that everything is caught up at this time, and many expenses are paid down. Mr. Blain noted that the line of credit has been paid down. He questioned if it was an operating line of credit that he tapped into for operations that he is now paying down. He questioned how high he could go with that line of credit. Mr. Campbell answered that he did not know but he could look it up for Mr. Blain.

Mr. Seeds suggested that it was rolled over into the mortgage in 2009. Mr. Seeds noted that it was \$300,000 and it was rolled over into the mortgage because M&T Bank called it. Mr. Campbell noted that 2008 and 2009 were horrible years when Medicare started to cut back on services and payments. He noted that he was \$26,000 in the red, thus the reason for the finance situation. He noted that the money market and other account were a little higher than normal, but it is all under control.

Mr. Blain questioned if the Medicare and Medicaid collections are still taking 90 to 100 days to collect. Mr. Campbell answered that it is really around 90 days for collections. Mr. Blain questioned if that was the majority of the billing. Mr. Campbell answered that it made up 70% of the business. Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Campbell is probably more aggressive in billing, doing it right away. Mr. Campbell explained that a trip sheet has to be submitted right away and all weekend call information is sent out Monday or Tuesday at the latest to the billing company.

Mr. Crissman noted that the debt service in 2009 was \$294,000 and in 2010 it jumped to \$528,000. He questioned what the debt service was for 2011 and what was budgeted for 2012. He questioned if there was a trend or pattern for the debt service noting that he only had the figures for 2009 and 2010. Mr. Campbell noted that he would have to get that information for Mr. Crissman. Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Campbell had a report that would show the line

items for what was spent in 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 and what was budgeted for 2012. He explained that he would like to see the history of individual line items. He noted that he could see if that line item went up or down, what the current budget was, where he would anticipate being at the end of 2012 and the last column would be for 2013. He noted that he is looking for trends in line items, up or down, noting that is why he is asking for the debt service noting that there was a huge jump from \$294,000 to \$528,000. He questioned if the debt service will jump higher in 2011. He noted that you will need to budget revenue since it is a fixed debt service. He noted that a salary line would show growth, showing the current year budget, the projection for the end of the year, and the last column would be a working tool for 2013. He explained that he has to float back and forth between two reports to try to capture the trends. Mr. Campbell noted that he has a report that shows the budget and actual for 2009, 2010, and 2011. Mr. Crissman noted that he does not need to see what was budgeted in 2009 or 2010 as those years are done, more importantly, what was actually spent in 2009 and 2010. He noted that he would appreciate if Mr. Campbell would share this information with Mr. Wolfe.

Mr. Blain noted that the Executive Report showed that overtime costs increased significantly. He questioned why that was. Mr. Campbell explained, around the holidays, from Thanksgiving to middle of January, the overtime increases since employees start using much of their time. He noted this year he lost three full-time employees; however, they have been replaced. He noted that the overtime was increased drastically for January only at a rate of 2.3%. Mr. Blain questioned what the shift schedules are. Mr. Campbell answered that his personnel work 12-hour days and some work 24-hour shifts. Mr. Blain questioned if that is permitted. Mr. Campbell noted that he currently has four employees that work 24-hour shifts and many EMS in the area work 24-hour shifts. Mr. Johnson noted that it is not uncommon in fire and EMS service, noting that they normally get some time to sleep during their shifts. Mr. Campbell noted that he averages between 24 to 30 calls over a 24-hour period; so generally speaking, an employee could get four to five hours sleep.

Mr. Campbell noted that a Finance Committee was formed to work on the 2012 budget, which consisted of four directors, himself, the administrator and the CEO. Mr. Crissman questioned if any of the Board of Supervisors were included in that meeting. Mr. Campbell

answered no. Mr. Blain suggested that it is made up of operations personnel. Mr. Campbell stated that he was the only one from operations.

Mr. Crissman noted that the municipal contributions in 2009 were almost \$362,000 and in 2010 it dropped to \$357,000 which means that someone didn't pay. He noted that he does not have the figure for 2011 to see if that line item increased or decreased and he questioned what is projected for 2012. He questioned if municipalities are not making payments. Mr. Blain noted for the 2012 budget, it lists \$290,000 and in 2011, it was \$353,000. Mr. Crissman noted that it was a little less than what it was in 2010. Mr. Blain questioned why it was lower. Mr. Campbell explained that he is working to renegotiate the contract with Middletown Borough and he did not drop it for that reason. He noted that the Middletown Station is now housed in the Middletown Fire Company building so there is no rent for those services. He noted the station that was flooded was rented. He stated that he did not know if Middletown increased their cost to the SCEMS, but he stated that some of the allotments fall into January and February and it could make a change in the numbers. Mr. Crissman noted that the auditors should be accruing that amount. He noted if the municipal contribution rate is decreasing then he would like to know why, as everyone should be paying their fair share. He noted the membership in 2009 was \$197,500; 2010 it was \$182,700, but he questioned what it was in 2011. Mr. Blain answered that it was \$180,000 in 2011. Mr. Crissman noted that these are the kinds of numbers that help him assess the budget in order to be able to ask intelligent questions. He noted that he is concerned about the debt service because an increase would have a major impact on revenues.

PSD Johnson questioned if there is a plan for the replacement of ambulances. He noted that the ambulances have significant mileage on them with the lowest having 135,000 miles. Mr. Campbell suggested that the lowest mileage is 98,000 miles. He explained that he has developed a five-year plan for replacement, noting that he is projecting to purchase two additional ambulances this year, one through a grant. He noted that he is flying to Florida to pickup the ambulances. Mr. Crissman noted that is good information to know in the planning for a five-year budgetary purpose.

Mr. Seeds noted the budget lists contributions from East Hanover Township as \$23,000 plus membership. He questioned what that meant. Mr. Campbell explained that East Hanover Township pays for all their resident's memberships to SCEMS. He noted that the \$47,000 is

what they pay for membership fees. Mr. Crissman noted that you could also add to that tally all the funds that come from the residents from each municipality for membership fees that they pay. He explained that he wants to look at how the numbers fluctuate. He questioned what was budgeted for 2012. PSD Johnson stated that it was \$194,000. He noted that SCEMS is budgeting higher than actuals for 2009 and 2011. Mr. Campbell noted that he increased the fees for EMS calls, Para-Transits calls, and memberships, so it was projected with the same membership numbers but at the higher fee schedule.

Mr. Blain questioned how lodging the ambulance in the Middletown Fire Company is working. Mr. Campbell answered that it works out well since it provides that someone is there 24 hours a day but they don't like that SCMES has its monitoring system on because it is constant transmissions. He explained that SCEMS has a bay and shares an office with their line officers; however, and the items are not as secured as they need to be so secured cabinets had to be moved to that facility. He noted that the data for the trip sheets, as per HIPA, had to be secured behind two locked doors which is a back door and an office door. He noted that Middletown has been very accommodating to SCEMS for operations. Mr. Seeds questioned if there are any issues with the storage of drugs, etc. Mr. Campbell answered that all narcotics must be double locked, and every 12 hours when a new shift starts, all the narcotics are inventoried. Mr. Seeds questioned if anyone from the fire company sleeps in the fire station. Mr. Campbell answered no.

Mr. Blain questioned if the Local Share Gaming Grant will cover 100% of the construction costs for the new facility. Mr. Campbell answered that it will cover all but \$50,000 the cost of a generator. Mr. Blain questioned how much the grant was for. Mr. Campbell answered that it was for \$464,000. Mr. Blain questioned when the project would start. Mr. Campbell answered that the project has been put out for bids and he must occupy the space by March of 2013.

PSD Johnson questioned how many ambulances will be housed in the new building. Mr. Campbell answered five, with three bays in the front and two bays in the back, a locker room, four bathrooms, an additional room for expansion, male and female bunk rooms, bathrooms for both, and a large kitchen with an island in the middle. He explained that he started a new system in 2012 where all the gear and medication will be inventoried. He noted when a medication is

removed from the storage area or equipment is removed it must be scanned and accounted for in 2012.

Mr. Seeds noted when Brown, Schultz, Sheridan and Fritz (BSSF) conducted the audit; they noted that SCEMS borrowed \$53,000 in 2008 to purchase a 2000 year ambulance. He suggested that was an incorrect amount. Mr. Blain explained that it was not an audit report, noting that all BSSF did was to take the financial statement that was provided to them and put it in a format of a financial statement. He noted that the numbers in the footnotes could be wrong because BSSF only compiled the numbers. Mr. Campbell noted that SCEMS had a forensic audit completed for 2007 through 2010 by Hummingbird Solutions. He noted that he could provide the Board with those documents noting that their records were superb. Mr. Blain questioned why a forensic audit was completed. Mr. Campbell answered that he did not know as he was not involved with it. Mr. Blain noted that a forensic audit is typically done when there is a suspicion of theft or an impropriety occurred. Mr. Campbell explained that Mr. Calhoun stated that he does a forensic audit every four years. Mr. Blain questioned if Hummingbird Solutions is a specialized organization that deals with EMS companies checking for the HIPPA regulations and how the records are maintained. Mr. Campbell stated that they check everything. PSD Johnson noted that a four-year forensic audit would be astronomical in costs. Mr. Blain suggested that it might have been a compliance check for HIPPA regulations and documentation. He noted that he would like to know what Hummingbird Solutions does. He noted that their website states that it is a defense contract auditing agency. He noted that this is probably due to SCEMS collecting Medicare and Medicaid payments.

Mr. Campbell noted that the year 2012 for SCEMS will be a very interesting year with the amount of ambulances that they will be putting on the street and changing the way the operations will be done.

Review of staff proposals to purchase 2 police motorcycles
and to replace police handguns and holsters

Mr. Wolfe noted that PSD Johnson provided a memorandum to the Board regarding the purchase of motorcycles, handguns and holsters.

Mr. Blain questioned if the purchase of the motorcycles was in the 2012 capital budget. PSD Johnson answered that it was not. Mr. Crissman noted that is why the Board is discussing

this since it is outside the budget. Mr. Wolfe noted that there is an outside funding source for it. PSD Johnson noted in 2008, a patrol officer made a vehicle stop that resulted in the Police Department receiving forfeiture funds. He noted that the money was shared with Federal and Dauphin County with the Township receiving the majority of the funds. He noted that the funds were not allowed to be put into the General Fund. Mr. Wolfe explained that the funds are in a separate fund.

Mr. Crissman noted that the expenditure to purchase two police motorcycles meets the requirements and it is the recommendation of the PSD Johnson to use those funds to purchase the motorcycles. Mr. Wolfe noted that the total bill from Harley Davidson with the trade in is \$18,400 and the price falls below the new bid limit of \$18,500. He noted that this can be done as a three telephonic price quotation. He noted that the original price was just a little higher but the dealer came back with a lower price. PSD Johnson noted that the Department only has one Harley Davidson motorcycle at this time. Mr. Seeds questioned what happened to the other motorcycle. PSD Johnson explained that the Police Department leased two motorcycles years ago, paying \$100 per month and when the lease expired, there was only enough funds to purchase one motorcycle.

Mr. Blain questioned if Harley Davidson leased many police motorcycles. PSD Johnson noted that it is the most popular police motorcycle. He noted that he is not looking to purchase a new motorcycle as it would cost well over \$20,000. He noted that the two motorcycles were previously owned by the Chambersburg Police Department and have very low mileage. He noted that Harley Davidson will service both motorcycles to ensure that they are in very good shape. Mr. Crissman questioned why the motorcycles are being traded in. PSD Johnson explained that Chambersburg Police Department trades their bikes every two years. He noted that the motorcycles are only assigned to one operator. Mr. Crissman questioned PSD Johnson if he feels comfortable purchasing these motorcycles. PSD Johnson answered that he had his motorcycle instructor check out the bikes and the general manager from Harley Davidson would not sell anything below standard to the Police Department.

PSD Johnson noted that the cost of purchasing two motorcycles would be \$26,400 minus the trade of \$8,000. Mr. Seeds questioned if 33,000 is high mileage for a motorcycle. PSD Johnson noted that it is not necessarily high mileage but the current motorcycle is in need of

significant repairs in excess of \$3,000 and it won't pass inspection. Mr. Seeds questioned if the motorcycles is serviced at Harley Davidson. PSD Johnson answered yes, since driving a motorcycle could be dangerous and he does not need equipment failure to occur while an officer is driving a motorcycle.

Mr. Blain questioned how many miles are on the motorcycles to be purchased. PSD Johnson answered that one has 7,000 miles and the other has 6,000 miles. Mr. Blain questioned what the benefit of having police officers driving motorcycles is, other than the fact that they could drive off-terrain if they wanted to chase someone. PSD Johnson noted they are used for community outreach programs, in the malls, especially during the holiday season, apartment complexes, getting into locations much quicker noting that they can drive through grass and fields. He noted that they can negotiate getting to traffic accidents in heavy traffic. He noted that they were most recently used in the Forest Hills details. Mr. Blain questioned how many years of service will the Police Department get from these motorcycles. PSD Johnson suggested that they will get roughly five years of service. He noted with gasoline prices climbing it will save on fuel costs.

Mr. Blain questioned how many bicycles the Police Department has. PSD Johnson answered that we have six or eight. Mr. Blain questioned what types of bicycles they are. PSD Johnson answered that they use Smith and Wesson, a special police bicycle. Mr. Blain questioned how old are the bicycles. PSD Johnson noted that some are old, but they don't take the beating that the motorcycles take and he has an officer who is certified to maintain the bicycles. Mr. Blain questioned where the bicycles are used. PSD Johnson answered that they are deployed to certain areas of high crime, or neighborhood complaints for such things as speeding. He noted that they also work stop signs by parking the bicycles in driveways. Mr. Seeds questioned how the bikes are hauled to locations. PSD Johnson answered that sometimes they are hauled with the SUV or an officer may ride the bikes to certain locations. Mr. Blain questioned if they are steel or aluminum frames. PSD Johnson noted that he did not know. Mr. Blain noted that the new bikes are much lighter which allows the driver to go much faster.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the radios would be an additional cost for the motorcycle. PSD Johnson answered that he has one police motorcycle radio that was provided by Dauphin County

and he will purchase an adapter with a plug to be used for the portables. He noted that there will not be any additional costs for radios.

PSD Johnson explained that the fund balance for the forfeiture funds is around \$78,000 and the federal government prefers that it be spent down as quickly as possible. He noted that the Police Department has kept the funds longer than the federal government would like and they would like us to spend all the funds this year. He noted that he and Mr. Wolfe must sign off that the funds are appropriately used for non-budgeted police only items. He noted that the motorcycles are non-budgeted items, and without the funds the Department would not be able to afford to purchase the motorcycles or repair the existing unit. He noted that the Department could lose the money if it doesn't spend it, and the next time it receives similar funds the federal government may not give it to us.

Mr. Wolfe noted that since the Board is okay with purchasing the two motorcycles, PSD Johnson would like to discuss the purchase of new handguns.

PSD Johnson noted that the Department currently uses the Sig Sauer 226 which is a 40 caliber handgun that holds 13 total rounds. He noted that the guns were purchased eight years ago and the manufacturer recommends that the guns be returned to be retooled. He noted that the night sights on many of the guns are not working. He explained that the guns could be sent back to the manufacturer to be retooled at a cost of \$400 per gun or he could trade the guns in and purchase new guns. He noted that it is his recommendation to trade in the old guns and purchase the same exact model. He explained that the trade in for each gun would be \$375 with the new guns costing \$650 a piece. He noted that nine Sig Sauer Model P239, second generation model would be purchased for the detectives and lieutenants. He explained that it is a smaller gun, and has a few less rounds, but it is designed for officers who wear plain clothes, noting that the Department had to replace some sports coats since the 226 models are causing wear and tear to the clothes. He noted that the contract calls for replacing clothes that are damaged in the line of duty.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the Federal grant would cover the entire cost of the purchase of new handguns. PSD Johnson answered that the grant will cover the costs of the weapons noting that the Edward Byre grant is for \$13,731.00 He noted that the costs for the handguns

after trade will be \$11,175.00. He noted that the left over funds will be used to purchase holsters. He explained that this grant needs to be spent very soon.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the forfeiture funds could be used to purchase the handguns. PSD Johnson answered yes. Mr. Crissman noted that he watched an episode of 60 Minutes where they showed how criminals have much more powerful guns than the average police officer. He questioned if the Police Department needs to increase its weapons to counter that which is on the street and if so, could the Department use some of the forfeiture funds to do that. PSD Johnson answered that the Department could use some of the federal forfeiture funds to purchase weapons. He noted that Mr. Crissman is talking about automatic weapons or rifles and the Department has those weapons now. Mr. Blain questioned if there are shotguns in the vehicles. PSD Johnson answered yes and he stated that they are functional. He noted that a shotgun round will only go so far, however, when you fire an AR15 round you could hit someone in the next county. He noted that his people are trained in the when and how to use those weapons.

Mr. Seeds noted that the requisition only requests eight Sig Sauer Model P239. PSD Johnson noted that that action request was prepared by the firearms instructor. Mr. Wolfe questioned if staff can move forward with the purchasing of the weapons. Mr. Crissman answered yes.

Mr. Seeds questioned what the detectives and lieutenants are currently using. PSD Johnson answered that they carry the Sig Sauer Model 226. He questioned what would happen to those handguns. PSD Johnson answered that all the handguns will be traded in. He noted that they have a few new guns, and those will be kept as spares in the event that they are needed.

Discussion regarding the composition and mission of the Public Safety Committee

Mr. Wolfe noted that PSD Johnson has come to the Board in the past to discuss the productivity of the Public Safety Committee in its current format. He noted that part of the issue is that the citizen members have limited knowledge of public safety activity and have not been able to provide as much help to the committee activities. He noted that there is some concern that the other members of the Committee such as the firemen and EMS don't interact with them in a proper fashion. He noted that it is his belief that the Public Safety Committee needs to exist in a

functional capacity and he has prepared a draft resolution that changes the Committee. He noted that it maintains the presidents and chiefs of the three fire companies, a representative of emergency medical services, the public safety director, and adds the fire marshal and the emergency operations center coordinator. He noted that it changes the meeting time from monthly to quarterly meetings, and maintains much of the similar goals and objectives that were in the original resolution that formed the Committee but adds a review of the Length of Service Appreciation Plan (LOSAP). He noted that staff requests comments from the Board members for the proposed changes.

Mr. Crissman questioned why not as he thought it was a good idea. Mr. Hawk noted that up to this point citizens have been members of the Committee. PDS Johnson explained that several citizens are outstanding individuals; however he found that the fire services and EMS don't want to get into the nitty-gritty about what is going on with the citizens present and providing input into things they don't understand. He noted that they don't want to get into a debate with the citizens. He noted that the meetings usually last 15 to 20 minutes with very little being accomplished. He noted that for most months when a request for agenda items is requested, the fire chiefs respond that they have nothing for the meeting. Mr. Hawk suggested that it may open up the conversation within the Committee. PSD Johnson answered that it will improve the dialogue.

Mr. Blain noted that this would change the composition of the Public Safety Committee to remove the citizen members and add the fire marshal and the emergency operations center coordinator. PSD Johnson suggested that we may want to add the deputy emergency operations center coordinator. Mr. Blain noted that having 11 members is too many. Mr. Wolfe noted that only having one member from each fire company is problematic as the fire companies operate in two separate fashions: business operations to involve budget and finance and the fire operations which include the fire fighters in the field. He noted for Linglestown Fire Company they are two separate entities within the organization. He noted for the Committee to be productive you need both.

Mr. Crissman questioned if it would be good to have a Supervisor as a member. Mr. Blain suggested that it would not be a good idea. Mr. Crissman agreed. PSD Johnson noted that

he would be the liaison for the Township. Mr. Seeds noted that any recommendations that the Committee would make would have to be approved by the Board of Supervisors.

PSD Johnson noted that the Committee was established years ago because the fire companies could not get along and nothing was getting done and there was constant fighting. Mr. Crissman noted that this will make all three fire companies work together. PSD Johnson noted that there are issues at times, but since the last meeting he has met with all three chiefs and they have since met for lunch and things are much better.

Mr. Wolfe noted that this will be on the agenda for the January 17, 2012 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 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman
Township Secretary