

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop Meeting held September 10, 2013

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

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

Also in attendance was George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steven Stine, Township Solicitor; Public Safety Director David Johnson; Chief William Payne and President, Mike Kraska, Linglestown Fire Company; Chief Mike Fife, Paxtonia Fire Company; Chief Tom Swank, Colonial Park Fire Company; Mark McNaughton, McNaughton Company; 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.

Discussion with the Public Safety Committee regarding  
extraordinary repairs to primary firefighting apparatus

Mr. Wolfe noted during the Board meeting held last Tuesday night, the Board took action to approve a request from the Colonial Park Fire Company to approve expenditures for extraordinary repairs to engines 33 and 33-1. He noted that the action was taken in accordance with a recommendation from the Public Safety Committee (PSC) to approve the repairs listed as extraordinary repairs in accordance with the Fire Equipment Capital Plan (FECF) which allows for such expenditures on a limited basis. He noted after the Board approved the repairs, it stated that it wanted to discuss this in greater detail with the firemen, and as a result, they were invited to attend the Workshop session to discuss this and other items as well.

Mr. Crissman questioned what the definition of extraordinary repairs is. Chief Payne noted that Company 33's truck had some corrosion issues, a ladder needed to be repainted and some other issues and at that point in time, the Township reminded the Chiefs that the Township did not enter into a maintenance agreement with them for the equipment and that it was solely up to the individual fire companies to handle. He explained that it was determined that these requests were to be brought up on a case-by-case basis noting that if a motor or transmission goes out on a fire truck, it could cost anywhere from \$30,000 to \$50,000 in repair bills. He noted when it falls in near the end of the year; there may not be enough funds to cover the repair bill. He stated that he did not know if it was ever addressed in the agreement that the three fire chiefs would get together and if they agreed upon the expenditure, they would bring it forward. He suggested that was how it was agreed upon. He noted that his tower truck had \$22,000 in repairs last year and his Board wanted him to bring it to the Township but he chose not to do that. He noted that each fire company is in charge of its own maintenance unless it is something catastrophic.

Mr. Hawk noted that Linglestown paid for its repair. He suggested if an engine is blown it would qualify as an extraordinary expense. He noted if his car is broken down he can't go to his parents and ask them to pay for it as he must pay for it himself. He noted that we need to determine what qualifies as an extraordinary repair.

Mr. Seeds explained that he brought it up during the business meeting and the Board approved the expenditure at that time. He noted that the Public Safety Director (PSD) had a question about the expenditure. He noted that Resolution 2009-11 that was passed by the Board stated that funds could be used for extraordinary and unanticipated expenses. He noted that he looked at the list of repairs and saw oil changes and filters and things like that and his thought was that was normal maintenance. He noted that all the Board members support the fire companies but his concern was that it would deplete the funds for the next round of equipment to be purchased. He noted that we need to figure out what is an extraordinary repair and what is not.

Chief Swank stated that he agreed with the routine maintenance, noting that we all send our rigs out three times a year for routine maintenance. He noted that it would be up to him to take care of that but this was motor work that needed to be done that was beyond what his in-

house mechanic could take care of and that is why he submitted the bills. He noted that this work was not in his budget. Mr. Seeds questioned if the reason they changed the oil was because... Mr. Swank answered that they redid the entire motor. He explained that he would not continue seeking funds from that account. Mr. Hawk noted if you do that there will not be enough money in the capital fund and when you need a piece of equipment there will be no money to purchase it with.

Chief Fife noted that we keep the fire apparatus too long before we replace it. He noted if ladder 34 was to be replaced in today's dollars it would cost \$950,000. He noted if we keep it ten years then the Board would get some resale for the equipment. He noted since we are keeping the apparatus for 18 years, ladder 34 would only be good for a tailgate vehicle. He noted after ten years, since the heavy trucks that sit in a firehouse are driven like a racecar, not like a Sunday afternoon sedan, noting that engine 34-1 carries enough weight that it should have two axels under the back ending resulting in half the breaking surface and twice as much weight. He noted that he is encountering more maintenance costs. He noted that he does not want to go to the FECF for apparatus repairs unless it is absolutely extraordinary. He noted that his opinion would be that each fire company has three pieces of fire apparatus, there should be a cap of \$25,000 per those three pieces of apparatus; \$75,000 coming off of the \$132,000 that was received last year. He noted that it leaves adequate funding for station maintenance to keep the lights on. He noted that he only budgets \$15,000 for maintenance but engine 34-1 has repair costs of almost \$30,000 but it is a two-fold problem. He noted that we are not replacing apparatus as quickly as we should from a cost point. He noted if the Township buys a fire truck every 18 years, at the end of the 18 years the fire truck is scrape metal. He noted for Engine 82, the Paxtonia Fire Company put \$2,300 into that fire truck so the Township could sell it for \$2,500. He noted that he ate that cost with some help from the guys from Linglestown as we sold the apparatus, but it would have been worth more and cost less from a maintenance standpoint had it not been so old. He stated that he does not know what the solution is.

Mr. Seeds noted when the FECF started the Board was told by the PSC at that time that they figures they could get 18 years out of the equipment. Mr. Blain noted that they may have said 18 years as it is the life expectancy with maintenance that you could expect. He noted that you can drive the equipment for 18 years, but at the end of that time there is no residual value

left versus the option of driving the equipment for ten years, having some residual value, providing for a trade in value to buy a new piece and reducing the long term maintenance cost. Chief Fife agreed. He noted that the radiators on the 298 Seagrave units had to be replaced at a considerable cost because at that time no one had the foresight to make a tilting cab so they could get to it and maintain it. He noted that they had to take the cab off and it was a very labor intensive repair. He noted that neither of those two cooling systems failed until after year ten. He noted after that time you start getting into a lot of maintenance dollars. Mr. Blain noted that it would be no different than a car, if you are driving a car ten plus years, like he is, there will be costs incurred and no residual value left in his car.

Chief Payne noted in 1997, the number of fire calls may have only been 300 for the year. Chief Swank noted that he will run about 800 calls this year. Chief Payne noted that it doubles the mileage for what was expected back then and costs more to maintain.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he distributed the status of the FECF; one that was developed in mid 1990's to serve nine primary pieces of firefighting apparatus, three for each of the three fire companies with an 18 year expectancy per piece of equipment. He noted that is how it was adopted and the purchases that have been made in accordance with that plan are to the tune of \$4 million. He noted if the Board is looking to restructure the plan, this is where we are to date. Mr. Hawk noted if we restructure the plan he would want to work with the PSC to do this and then have them come back with a recommendation. He noted that we are discussing Phase V of the Fire Equipment Capital Fund as well as the next issue on the agenda.

Mr. Blain noted that the Board needs to discuss extraordinary repairs and if we need to define what that is from the Board's perspective so when a request is received for approval there is a clear definition of what it means. Mr. Hawk noted that we can't continue to rob the RECF to a point where there isn't enough funds to purchase new equipment.

Chief Payne suggested that you will have a hard time doing that. He noted if you try to do it using a dollar amount it will be hard because when a fire truck goes in for service, they want to find as much wrong as they can, noting that for the last aerial inspection there were three pages of stuff that needed to be fixed, so if you come up with a dollar amount he could easily get to \$25,000 for repairs for his ladder truck if that is what is needed to be considered an extraordinary expense. He suggested that it must be based upon major components for the fire truck Mr. Blain

noted that is what he is trying to get to, not a dollar amount, but more like a clearly defined type of repair. He noted that an extraordinary repair could be \$1,500 or \$50,000. Chief Fife noted that he did not mean \$25,000 aggregate for the year but more of a catastrophic failure. He noted that is what it should be to reach that much, noting that it would have to be motor or transmission or something considerable. He noted that he had to change the radiator and it was only \$12,000 but it was not catastrophic, but an engine could be \$20,000 to \$30,000. He noted that different parts of the aerials are very expensive. He noted that there are many systems on the fire trucks and they are starting to need to be repaired due to their age but other than the motor or transmission, drive train or rear end, or the lift equipment for the aerials, you will not breach \$25,000.

Mr. Hawk noted that Chief Payne suggested that a list should be made for those items that require catastrophic repairs and come up with a figure. He suggested that the Board is not qualified to come up with listing of equipment as it has to come from the fire chiefs. Mr. Blain suggested that it be put on the agenda for the next PSC meeting to come up with a clear definition of what extraordinary repairs would be.

Mr. Crissman noted that he needs the PSC to define what extraordinary repairs are. He noted the fire fighters have an idea of what it is. He questioned if they know what it is now. Chief Swank noted that to him it is anything above and beyond normal maintenance. Mr. Crissman questioned if that is his opinion only and not a collective opinion. He noted that you need to determine a collective opinion from all three fire chiefs, and if the fire chiefs are not sure then how do they expect the Board members to know what it should be.

Mr. Matt Miller noted that it could be something that results in eminent danger to life or safety on the truck or what would put the vehicle out of service. He noted that an out of service fire truck is an anchor and it is not serving anyone any good.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the fire companies are responsible for all routine maintenance and scheduled maintenance as required by the manufacturer including tires, belt, and windshield wipers. Mr. Crissman noted that those kinds of thoughts are what is needed to be reduced to writing so that everyone is on the same page. He noted that it would cost more money but when it comes to health and safety of the citizens, then it has to be spent. PSD Jonson noted that it would have to be determined for each piece of equipment. Chief Swank noted if we would go

with what Mr. Wolfe's suggested and the Committee reviewed it, then it is defined. Mr. Crissman noted that we must all be on the same page for this. Chief Payne noted that his only fear about that is, for example, he takes his truck to KME to get it fixed as it is ten or eleven years old, but every year he wants to go to the Dauphin County Parade; therefore, if his door is scratched up, he may want to paint it and to some it would be an expenditure that needs to be done, but to other people it is just a 12-year old fire truck. Mr. Crissman noted that it becomes very subjective. Mr. Kraska noted that he liked Mr. Miller's wording in that if it is something that is life threatening or a danger to public safety... Mr. Crissman noted that you have to be careful with the words that you use as they need to be measurable. He noted that Chief Payne's point is well taken.

Chief Fife noted that the City of Harrisburg has a truck sitting in their station because it needs 8 tires; he noted that is routine maintenance. He noted that the most expensive items for a heavy truck are the drive train, engine, and transmission.

Mr. Crissman noted whatever you use for the definition of extraordinary repairs it has to be measurable as it should be easy for anyone to determine that it is measurable. Chief Payne noted that he would work with Rod Calhoun, Susquehanna Township's mechanic, and some others to come up with major components that they may think would be included such as the pump on the engine, motors, and drive trains. He suggested that he could come up with a list of ten items and he could bring it to the PSC and then bring it back to this Board. Mr. Crissman noted that it must come from the PSC as the fire chiefs deal with it every day. Chief Swank noted that he will speak with Lee Coburn.

Mr. Hawk noted if the PSC comes up with a list that the Board can relate to on a realistic basis, the funds come from the FECF; however, we have to be conscious to use the fund in a very frugal way. Chief Payne noted since 2001, it has only been dipped into once, so it is not a common occurrence and if we come up with a list then we won't dip into it unless it falls within the list of items.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there was one before this request. Mr. Wolfe answered yes and that is what created the resolution in the first place, in order to spend \$25,000. Mr. Crissman noted that he likes the idea of bringing in outside help as well. Chief Fife noted if we have a catastrophic event, Paxtonia takes it out of the investment account that he wouldn't have if it

weren't for the taxpayers. He noted that it may not come from the money that the Board provides but the fundraiser funds come from the taxpayers. He noted that it is a zero sum game and he is not sure that the Township residents want to hand their money over so that the fire companies can manage financial investments. He noted that we keep funds set aside for when we get the \$30,000 repair bill and that is how we have paid it up to now. He questioned how much do you want the fire companies to have in investment accounts before they come to the Board asking for money when they are sitting on \$300,000 in what is tax payer funds. He noted as a taxpayer he does not want the Board of Directors at Paxtonia Fire Company deciding on investment dollars. He noted that the money is out there and in the end it belongs to the taxpayers anyway.

Mr. Miller noted that it is a good check and balance as the fire companies shoot themselves in the foot if they nickel and dime the apparatus replacement fund and bleed it dry; then they won't get new fire trucks. He noted if Linglestown chose to do some repairs internally with their own funds and they didn't have to use the FECF that keeps the fund in tact so that the overall goal of getting new apparatus can be achieved. He noted that it does the fire company no good not to maintain their trucks because they won't get a new one if they bleed the fund dry by coming to the Township to do these things. He noted that it is a good check and balance system.

Discussion with the Public Safety Committee regarding  
Phase IV of the Fire Equipment Capital Plan

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board completed Phase III if the Fire Equipment Capital Plan (FECF) about five years ago and it has now accumulated roughly \$1 million in the fund and some equipment that has reached its 18 year life expectancy so it is prudent to begin the purchasing process for the next phase of the plan. He suggested that the PSC has started to work on this.

PSD Johnson noted that he has asked for proposals and he has received one from Linglestown for a pumper. He noted that Colonial Park is in the process of getting a proposal on an aerial piece. Chief Fife noted that Paxtonia is due a rescue and a ladder truck.

Mr. Crissman questioned Chiefs Swank and Fife when they would have their proposals ready. Chief Swank suggested that he could have it within a week, noting that he is trying to get the numbers down. He suggested that it would go through COSTARS, going with one vendor but

until we all know what we are doing, we can sit down with the vendor like what was done for the last round that turned in \$150,000 in savings. Chief Payne noted that it was a significant amount.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township is not in any rush; however he would like to start the process. Mr. Hawk noted that PSD Johnson has an initial proposal from Linglestown for a pumper. Chief Swank noted that his unit would cost around \$800,000 or less. PSD Johnson noted that the Linglestown proposal is \$527,533. Mr. Hawk noted that those units will cost about \$1.5 million. Chief Fife noted that it would be \$1.5 million for Paxtonia as he needs to replace an aerial and a pumper.

Mr. Blain noted that we are taking close to \$3 million for total expenditures. He noted that the balance in the account is only \$1 million. Mr. Wolfe noted that is correct, but in the past, the Board has allowed borrowing for the fund for future years. He noted at the current rate if you have \$1 million and you are spending \$3 million, it will take ten years to make up the payment with an annual contribution of \$200,000. He noted at the current rate of spend on an 18-year plan, we are not in sync anymore. Mr. Blain noted that a couple of years ago, we reduced that the \$250,000 to \$200,000 to fund the LOSAP fund. He noted that we never accounted for inflation and he suggested that the \$250,000 should be more like \$300,000, and now we are behind the eight-ball. He noted that we did not account for inflation only putting \$250,000 in each year.

Mr. Hawk noted that a request to spend \$3 million breaks the bank. He questioned how urgent are the purchases for the three fire companies for their equipment. Chief Swank answered that the piece that he is replacing is the oldest, the 18 year apparatus. Chief Payne noted that his equipment is not that old, but his concern is about his engine. He explained that Colonial Park purchased two engines and they decide which one goes, but his engine goes on every call. He noted that the wear and tear on his engine is a little bit more. He noted that his tower truck does not run the amount of calls that Colonial Park's does. He noted that he could hold off on replacing Truck 35. He noted that the three aerial devices in the Township do not get utilized as much as they possibly could be staggered in the replacement process. He noted that is his personal opinion. Mr. Crissman noted that Chief Payne would know what units need to be replaced and has established the priority which is what you should be doing. Chief Payne noted that the engines are busier than the tower trucks, and his unit is a 2000 model.

Mr. Blain questioned how much the Township spent in equipment in the last phase. Chief Payne noted that Tanker 35 cost \$285,000. Mr. Wolfe noted that the total amounts are listed on the page. Mr. Blain noted that \$1,274,000 was spent for the last round of trucks, and we are going from that to \$3 million. Chief Swank noted that the costs included a tanker, and engine. He noted that the 2000 KME that was replaced already is shy of 13,000 miles. Chief Fife noted in 2009, it included his engine, for a total of two engines and a tanker.

Mr. Hawk noted for his own personal budget, if he had \$1 million and needed equipment for \$3 million he would question where he would get the \$2 million.

Mr. Blain questioned when the capital plan was put in place in 1996, was it laid out to show the projected replacement dates for the equipment. He question if there was also a plan for projected costs, noting from 2009 to now, when you are talking about \$1 million from 2009 to \$3 million now, it sounds like we are talking about ladder trucks that we are replacing versus a smaller piece of equipment. He suggested that it should have been spaced out better instead of replacing huge pieces of equipment at one time.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the problem that we had is when we started the program, it was from a deficit position, so we had to purchase more in the beginning when we had no money available. He noted every time we have purchased under this plan, we had to purchase from a deficit position to purchase 9 pieces of equipment. He noted that we had to work them into the system to get on an 18-year rotation which we are not on. He noted that it was supposed to be three pieces that rotate every six years. He noted that we are not there and it is almost impossible to do that given that we upfront the purchased of three pieces of equipment. He noted that the Township came back in two years and purchase another three pieces. Mr. Blain noted that they are the pieces of equipment that we are talking about replacing now.

Chief Payne noted for Tanker 35, the 18 year window is not realistic. He noted that it is a 25 year piece because of the amount of calls; noting that the Township has to have it for the ISO ratings but it doesn't get used as much as the engines do. He noted that the market will drop out of it but it only cost \$275,000. He noted that it is a cheap fire truck. He explained, to trade it in every ten years for the resale value is not worth it as we should run it until we get nothing for it or it is unsafe. He noted for the engines, the price goes up between 5% and 8% every year for

that equipment. He noted that he drew up specifications, removed all the bells and whistles, but to replace what we already have is almost \$675,000.

Chief Fife noted that a lot of things have happened since the Board last bought fire trucks. He noted that petroleum goes into the manufacturing of heavy trucks for such things as wire insulation and rubber pieces, noting in 1998 gasoline was \$.85 a gallon and now it is \$4 a gallon. Mr. Seeds noted when we discussed this in 1995 we knew we would have to put more money in the kitty as the years went by due to inflation.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there is a short answer to all of this; we do not have an equipment replacement schedule, and we should have one. Mr. Blain noted that the Board is going to have to reconsider the \$250,000 that was put in the account since 1996. He noted, if you took inflation into account; the number should be closer to \$400,000. He noted that is using a market inflation rate, not a 5 to 8% inflation rate for the cost of a fire truck. Chief Fife suggested if you want to look ahead it should be closer to \$500,000.

Mr. Crissman requested the PSC to come up with a replacement schedule so the Board doesn't run into this situation in the future, even if it replaces one piece of equipment every year, knowing that the money goes into the budget and that it is always there. Mr. Blain agreed. Mr. Crissman explained that he had a replacement schedule for the school buses for every year.

Mr. Hawk questioned how long it takes to manufacture a piece of equipment. Chief Fife answered less than a year. Chief Fife noted that he has other options; he put money into the 1998 Seagrave noting that he had the paint touched up so he could run it a couple more years and he might replace the ladder truck first as that is the thing that would cost the most. He noted that his aerial unit will be inspected next month and he will also have pages of things to be fixed. He noted that he could drive the rescue engine for another two or three years and put the equipment on a schedule for replacement. He noted if it helps to roll one of Paxtonia's pieces back a couple of years and put it into the schedule and budget for it better, he is in a position to do that. He explained that he has the suppression engine so the rescue does not go out the door on every single call. He noted that the fire calls are handled by the 2009 fire suppression piece. Mr. Hawk noted that it would help. He noted that Chief Payne had an estimate of \$571,000 and \$800,000 for Chief Swank's piece of equipment. Chief Fife noted that Seagrave, which is not the first choice for Chief Payne, provided him with a price of \$850,000 for an aerial unit so they

were a little less than KME on a similar fire truck. Mr. Kraska noted that Chief Payne would not care what the unit is. Mr. Crissman noted that we are not to the point of discussing vendors yet.

Mr. Blain noted that Colonial Park has to get some final numbers to PSD Johnson, Linglestown has their numbers and Paxtonia is going to get numbers and from there the PSC could assess the situation and come back with a game plan.

Mr. Crissman noted that a larger piece of the plan is developing a replacement program schedule.

Mr. Hawk noted that there is a deficit of \$2 million. Mr. Blain suggested that the PSC might be able to determine some way to help with that. Chief Fife noted that extending the life of equipment to fit into a replacement program is not out of the question. Mr. Blain noted if we have a replacement schedule in place that is long term, say over a ten fifteen year period, the Board can better figure out what the cash flow needs will be and then it can turn over the equipment quicker than 18 years. He noted that he would like to know what the maintenance costs are over an 18-year period year-by-year. He suggested that it would go way up after year ten and it would support the argument that the equipment needs to be turned in faster to get more value out of a new piece of equipment rather than putting the maintenance costs into the old one. Chief Fife noted that the aerial pieces that are ten years old are selling for a couple \$100,000 and the 20 year pieces of equipment are selling for \$20,000 for parade events.

Mr. Kraska noted that many places are trading the pieces of equipment earlier to get a better trade in value. He noted that they are selling the equipment to fire companies that don't have the money that we do to purchase equipment. Mr. Blain noted when the FECF was put in place in 1996, the amount of calls that were run at that time were a lot less than what they are running today, therefore, 18 years ago it might have made sense to keep the equipment that long. He noted that things have changed and 18 years does not make sense anymore especially if you want to get any value out of the equipment; you will need to trade it in earlier. He noted that the mileage has changed for the equipment. Mr. Seeds noted that we have to look at what it costs per year for depreciation.

Mr. Blain noted that the PSC needs to determine what the appropriate replacement program should be and the Board must decide to put more money in that fund. Mr. Hawk noted if the PSC can come up with a schedule for the purchase of equipment it would provide the

Board the information it needs to make adjusts to the plan to purchase the equipment over time. Chief Fife noted if he drives Engine 1 a few more years it will provide the Township time to build up the funds. Mr. Crissman noted that it would provide him the opportunity to get that rig into the schedule, noting it would help with the major bumps for purchasing equipment. Mr. Hawk noted that we would still have a deficit but not nearly as great if we space out the purchase of the equipment.

Mr. Seeds noted that we need to figure out how to put more funds into the 2014 budget. Mr. Wolfe noted that we are approaching those discussions soon. Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Wolfe will put in as much money as the Board wants him to.

Mr. Mike Kraska wanted to discuss the fireworks for Koons Park for the 4<sup>th</sup> of July in 2014. Mr. Blain noted that it would be in the budget for next year.

Discussion with the Public Safety Committee regarding  
cost recovery for emergency response

Mr. Stine noted that he conducted research on this item and there is nothing specific that authorizes cost recovery for emergency responses but there is a general provision in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Class Township Code that would be broad enough to do it; however, there is one issue. He noted if the Township would adopt an ordinance as has been requested, it would have no enforcement authority because it doesn't have the authority to bill people for fire service or any other kind of emergency service or to authorize anyone else to bill for it. He noted that many insurance companies that receive those bills will throw it away and not pay it. He noted that it is not that we couldn't do the ordinance, it just doesn't mean anything.

Chief Fife explained that his fire company subscribes to a service; however, his biggest expenses are hazardous material incidents where he lays down thousands of dollars of material and can't get it back. He noted that we contracted with a company to try to bill non-township people's insurance company. He noted that the insurance companies tell you that they will not pay it and after ten year's he has recovered a little over \$3,000. He noted that it is hardly worth paying someone to administer the program as the insurance companies know that there is no legal right to bill for the service and they don't pay. He noted that with the incident that occurred on National Night Out, all the hazardous material items that he used, the towing company replaced them for him dollar-for-dollar and billed the trucking company for it. He

noted that is the one way that he can recover some of the money that he spends on emergency calls. He noted that he used two containment pools that cost \$300 a piece and \$1,200 of oil dry, and he bought all of Hornung's cat litter but he got the money back that way.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the emergency response to a Haz Mat incident is covered by a different law and is billable. Chief Swank noted that is if Dauphin County's Haz Mat Team is involved, but they weren't there. Chief Fife explained, only the duty officer came out, representatives from the Department of Environmental Protection stated that they would be out the next day and by then the fuel was in the ground. Chief Fife noted reimbursement can only occur if Dauphin County uses their equipment.

Mr. Matt Miller noted for West Hanover Township, the collection brings in five figures. He noted that the fire company receives about \$25,000 a year off of invoices for accidents. He noted that the municipality passed a resolution that strengthens the fire company's case that they support and recognize the need for the fire company to recoup its cost. He explained that the fire company has gone before the Magisterial Judge and as long as the fire company has UCR costs, the judgment turns in its favor.

Mr. Hawk questioned if it is worth a try, but suggested that the fire company should not be disappointed if they don't get anything. Mr. Miller noted that West Hanover Township (WHT) uses a service. PSD Johnson questioned if WHT goes after the people involved in the traffic accidents. Chiefs Fife and Swank did not agree that was a good idea. Mr. Miller noted that they caused the reason to expend the materials. Mr. Seeds questioned if West Hanover Township Fire Company bills the residents. Mr. Miller noted that they usually bill for motor vehicle accidents noting that it would depend on what it would be, usually for non-residents, but he will bill residents. Mr. Hawk questioned if you haven't gotten any response from the residents. Mr. Miller answered that some don't like it. He noted that he may settle a \$400 bill for less before he takes it to the Magisterial Judge. Chief Fife noted that there was an accident in West Hanover Township, a daytime call that he was on, noting when he looked through the windshield of the car he saw a face that he recognized. He noted that he cut the person out of the vehicle with Lower Paxton Township Fire Equipment, residents of Lower Paxton Township and they were billed by West Hanover Township for use of their rescue equipment. He noted that it is a very sticky situation. He noted that Rescue 36 immediately called for engine 34 because

during the day you will get two guys from Paxtonia so they respond right away. He noted that he ran the rescue tools that day so he knows who cut who out of the car and who did what. He noted for daytime calls, with limited manpower, we help each other out but it was an instance where we don't want to get caught billing our people and in the end it was Lower Paxton Township Fire Apparatus and personnel that cut that resident out of the car but West Hanover Township billed him for it. He noted that it created a big problem. He noted that it was in the news and it was ugly and it is the kind of thing that we want to stay away from. He noted if you can get the money from an insurance company that is one thing, but it doesn't become personal, but when we start taking taxpayers to task when they have an accident, then we are entering a slippery slope. Chief Swank noted that is how he did it in the past; he never submitted to residents, the bills always went to the insurance companies. He noted that it would not create anymore work for him as the insurance company accepts the report that he is submitting to PSD Johnson monthly. He noted that when you get a check, it is a win-win situation.

Mr. Blain noted that the last time Chief Swank presented this he stated that he would be going after the insurance company and not the residents. Chief Swank noted the he never submitted bills to the residents even with the old billing company. He noted if they did not pay it the bill went in the recycle can. Mr. Blain noted if we send bills to residents it opens a can of worms. Mr. Wolfe questioned if the Board wanted to prepare an ordinance. Mr. Hawk noted as long as they understand the risk or benefit, if you get something back it is a win. Mr. Blain questioned if the recovery agency only provides a percentage of what is collected. Chief Swank answered yes noting that there is no risk from the fire company.

Mr. Hawk noted if the Board adopts a resolution if it works, it works. Chief Swank noted that we currently have a resolution from a few years ago, but the company wanted an ordinance. Mr. Seeds questioned what would you charge for. Chief Swank answered vehicles accidents or fires. Mr. Hawk noted that Chief Swan provided a list previously. Mr. Seeds noted that he saw the list and questioned if they would charge for house fires or illegal fires. Chief Swank answered that it would be vehicle accidents, fire, fire alarms. He explained that he does not go to controlled burnings as that is a Police Department issue. He noted that his biggest concern is the nuisance fire alarms, noting that he has stopped giving the information as the fine money was deposited in the general fund and it should go back into the capital fund to help support the fund.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the fire company would charge individuals. Chief Swank answered that all the bills would go directly to the insurance company. Mr. Blain noted that he would only bill the insurance company. Chief Swank explained when he goes to a call he asks for the insurance information and then submits to the insurance company. He noted for West Hanover Township, if a bill was sent to an individual they would be upset as they pay a fire tax for services as a part of the property tax. Mr. Miller responded that they don't pay taxes if they are a non-resident. Mr. Seeds noted that is different.

Mr. Blain noted if you are only submitting to the insurance company it doesn't matter what municipality you are a resident in, you are only submitting to the insurance company and you will have a specific list of items that you would submit for so we can avoid potential issues of wrongful billing to the insurance company. He noted that Chief Swank needs an ordinance in place that allows them to do it. Mr. Seeds noted if you file a claim, many insurance companies will increase the policy rate, so they might be upset when they find out that the fire company filed a claim. Chief Swank noted that he had an accident in his job and his insurance company jacked up the rate because of the accident at his job.

Mr. Kraska noted if you had a fire in your home, the insurance company would raise the rates.

Mr. Hawk suggested that we do the resolution for the fire company. Mr. Kraska suggested that any money received from this should go into the FECF. Mr. Blain noted that he agrees with that and not into the General Fund. PSD Johnson noted that was not Chief's Swank intention. Chief Swank noted in the past, it was done to offset the cost of the fires. He noted that he made that suggestion for the fire alarms only, as currently he would submit for the fire alarms and when the money was received it would go into the Township's General Fund. He thought that those funds would have gone back into the FECF. He noted the way he submitted this request was that the money received from fire calls would go into the fire company's funds.

Mr. Seeds noted that Colonial Park would be the only fire company doing this out of the three. Mr. Kraska noted that he was under the impression that the funds should go back to the FECF. Mr. Crissman noted that this discussion should go back to the PSC for further discussion. He noted if we are going to discuss this for another 20 minutes then it needs to go back to the PSC for more discussion.

Mr. Blain noted that you need to discuss this at the PSC level, but the money should go back to the FECF and then you would have a reserve account to be used for repairs and maintenance. Mr. Seeds noted that this needs to go back to the PSC for more discussion. Mr. Blain noted if the funds go to the FECF then it would help to cover repairs and maintenance items. Mr. Kraska agreed.

Presentation by the McNaughton Company regarding the Kensington Way connection between Autumn Oaks and the Estates at Forest Hills

Mr. Wolfe noted that this request came to the Township as a surprise. He noted if you look at the subdivision plan for the Estates of Forest Hills, there is a cul-de-sac and a right-of-way connection for future development which is noted as the Estates at Autumn Oaks. He noted that the cul-de-sac was designed as a permanent cul-de-sac and that is how it was built as opposed as to a temporary one with a connection to the extending road. He noted that the curb and sidewalk were also installed. He explained that he became aware of the issue when Mr. McNaughton, the developer of the Estates at Autumn Oaks started to tear up the cul-de-sac to make the connection. He noted that the residents in the Estates of Forest Hills were upset. He noted the affected residents, Mr. McNaughton, Mickie Molinari and he had conversations and someone had Mr. Jeff Staub do a design to maintain the cul-de-sac as a roundabout, make the connection and have a traffic calming measure between the two developments much like what is in the Estates of Forest Hills. He noted that Mr. McNaughton is present to request the Board to permit an administrative amendment to both land and subdivision plans. He noted that staff would recommend this action.

Mr. Crissman noted that in the Estates they have a situation where they have the transition from Forest Hills into the Estates, and they have the very same situation.

Mr. Blain noted if we agree to this, will the cul-de-sac have a slight redesign to it. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mr. Mark McNaughton explained that it would have a vertical curb on the outside and a mountable curb on the inside. He noted that it allows for the emergency vehicles to traverse it and it meets all the criteria. He noted that the center section will be landscaped and maintained by the Homeowners Association (HOA) for Forest Hills.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the neighbors had an issue with it. Mr. McNaughton noted that the neighbors are in favor of the change, the HOA of Forest Hills supports the design, and the

developer from Forest Hills supports the design as well. He noted that everyone is in agreement to go ahead to do this but he needs administrative approval to do it for both plans. Mr. McNaughton stated that he expects the curbing to be fixed in two weeks and that is the reason why he is here.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the ones that are in existence now, are they able to accommodate emergency vehicles. He noted that it was to be permanent, but now that you are going to open it, does it accommodate all emergency vehicles to include school buses. Mr. McNaughton answered yes and explained that it was designed by Tim Mellott. Mr. Blain noted that the inside circle has a slant curb so if the fire trucks need to go over the curb, it would be okay. Mr. Crissman noted that the school buses are in there every day. He questioned if it will accommodate them. Mr. McNaughton answered yes.

Mr. Seeds noted that there are problems with the Linglestown roundabout and trucks going into the landscape area. Mr. Crissman noted that they will not have tractor trailers driving in this area. Mr. McNaughton noted that there are three other accesses to this area. Mr. Seeds questioned how big the concrete apron is. Mr. McNaughton noted that it is 40 feet across and the cart way is 20 feet, and would have a slant curb. Mr. Seeds noted that there may be an occasion where a large truck could get in this area. Mr. McNaughton noted that the fire trucks and school buses will be able to access the area.

Mr. Hawk noted that he is okay with it. Mr. Crissman noted that he is okay as long as it meets with the criteria that currently exist.

Mr. Wolfe questioned if Steve Fleming has looked at this. Mr. McNaughton answered that he met with Steve today and he is okay with it.

Review of a sketch plan for the proposed  
Benjamin Slotznick Hillside Road subdivision

Mr. Wolfe noted that he has several calls from Jeff Staub of Dauphin Engineering who wanted to know the Board's position in regard to the lot layout. He noted that Mr. Slotznick and Mr. Staub were at the last workshop session at which time the Board decided to view the site on its road tour; however it ran out of time and was unable to do so.

Mr. Wolfe explained that the discussion resolves around a subdivision plan of three lots noting that they all use a common driveway coming off of Hillside Road with an adjoining

driveway for Lot 70, one driveway serving Lot 68 and one for Lot 69. He noted that it was not met with rave reviews from the Township Engineer and would require waivers of the subdivision and land development regulations to approve it; however the Zoning Hearing Board has approved the specific zoning variance that would be needed for the plan.

Mr. Hawk noted that he drove by that area today and suggested that it is a heck of a drop off from the sidewalk level down... Mr. Blain noted that there is only sidewalk on one side of the street. Mr. Hawk noted that it is at Dartmouth and Hillside Roads. Mr. Blain explained that you have to drive to the end of Hillside Road, which is where this location is. He noted at Dartmouth Street at the stop sign turn right and drive down Hillside Road up the hill to the end of it. He noted that there is no sidewalk in that area. He noted that you come to the end of the road and that is where this is located. Mr. Seeds noted that it does drop off, but not drastically. Mr. Blain noted if you look at the bottom part of the layout, it is where the ravine runs through, running out to Rutherford Road. He noted that everything on the top of the road of that ravine is that development plan. He noted that it is flat in that location. Mr. Hawk noted that he looked at the wrong spot.

Mr. Seeds questioned what waivers would they need for the plan. Mr. Hawk suggested that it would be for roadway frontage.

Mr. Crissman noted that the engineer is not supporting the plan. Mr. Blain explained that is because it would appear that it would need a cul-de-sac. He noted if you build a cul-de-sac, it would take a good portion of the land away from the lots. Mr. Blain suggested that the cul-de-sac does not make any sense because we are only talking about one house that sits on the stub street and that is it. Mr. Wolfe noted, under the SALDO, you could put a cu-de-sac lower, with the lots coming off. Mr. Seeds noted that the Board discussed that with Mr. Slotznick. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board did not provide any direction in this instance. Mr. Seeds noted that they said they would build an area to push off the snow. He noted that it would be easier to have a place to push the snow as now you have a street that just ends. Mr. Crissman questioned where you would push the snow when you have driveways. Mr. Seeds noted that they said they would provide an area for that. Mr. Miller noted that staff would be pushing the snow on private property. He noted on a dead-end street it is easy to plow snow, you just drive in and push it to the end of the street and back up. Mr. Crissman noted that this empties into three dead-end streets. Mr. Miller

noted that it is hard for trucks with dead-in streets as you have to back the entire way out of the street. He noted that he can't turn a truck around in someone's driveway, and it looks like three driveways coming to an end of the roadway with no place to put the snow. He noted that Public Works would need to look at it much more closely to see what they are proposing.

Mr. Blain questioned for Hillside Road, how you plow the stub street. He noted that you need to go out to look at the road. He explained, if you drive up Hillside Street, you make a left onto Calvert Street and Hillside runs another 50 feet with one house in that location. He noted that public works is plowing that little street now. Mr. Miller noted that staff pushes the snow straight in. He noted that we won't have that option if there are three driveways straight in front of us. Mr. Blain noted unless the developer provides a place to put the snow. He noted that Mr. Staub stated that he would provide a place for that to occur. Mr. Miller noted for staff to be able to legally do it, we would have to have a public dedicated area to where the snow dump would be. Mr. Blain noted that the developer can provide snow storage according to the plan.

Mr. Miller suggested that the request for the waiver may be more economic than anything and he would hate to see an issue created that made it more difficult to do maintenance activities because of an economic hardship for the developer. He questioned if there is any reason for not putting the cul-de-sac in other than economic hardship. Mr. Wolfe answered that the engineering reason is that you can't get three lots. Mr. Wolfe noted for Hillside you could make it big enough to provide a turnaround and push snow straight ahead, and bring one driveway off for Lot 168 with Lot 169 going in another direction and the third lot in a third direction.

Mr. Miller noted that the hammerheads are tough for snow plow drivers as well. He noted that you would be dumping all the snow at the end, the same as you are doing now. Mr. Miller noted that we would have to plow the other two ends. Mr. Wolfe noted that we could dedicate one portion and they would be responsible for the rest. He noted that it is not an ideal situation. Mr. Blain noted that we are talking about a maintenance issue and questioned for an average snow year, how often do you plow. Mr. Miller answered every time it hits three inches. Mr. Wolfe noted that sometimes it might be two times and another time it could be 15 times. Mr. Blain noted that it is not a once a week issue. He noted that we are talking about a snow event. Mr. Miller noted that he would be glad to put Mr. Blain in a snow plow. Mr. Blain noted that he has driven in snow plows before.

Mr. Miller noted that we have existing areas in the Township that are not ideal for numerous different reasons, but he would hope when something new comes in that Public Works has an opportunity to do it right from the ground up so we don't make the same issue come back and forth that we have had to deal with in the past. He noted that there is a way to do this and maybe three lots can't fit in this area. He noted that he has a  $\frac{3}{4}$  acre lot and he can't have 12 horses just because he may want them. He noted that you have to buy a piece of property with the legality of what you want to do when you buy it. He noted if things come like this in the future and the Board is not sure about it, he would like to have the person who runs the plow route provide their input and get it back to the Board members. He noted that they are the ones who will be dealing with this at four in the morning and he would value their input versus himself as he is not on the route and does not plow that road.

Mr. Wolfe questioned if the Board had any direction to provide to Mr. Slotznick at this time. Mr. Seeds suggested that he should work with the Public Works Department to make sure there is a place to locate the snow and turn the plow around. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it would have to be a cul-de-sac.

Mr. Crissman noted that the realities of life, with those three driveways emptying as a commonality, when the owners start fighting among themselves, one of the issues will be the right of the driveway and who is doing what and who is having it blacktopped and the other are not paying for their sections, then they will come to us and ask for a meeting. He noted that it is not the Board's job and it has to be resolved between themselves and their attorneys and he does not like it.

Mr. Miller noted that he is not against the development but if it could occur in such a way that it doesn't create additional issues for maintenance then it is fine. Mr. Seeds noted that they would have to blacktop the driveway 50 feet in for each driveway. He noted that they would have to have a dedicated turnaround and a place to put snow. Mr. Crissman questioned if it would become the Township's property. Mr. Seeds answered yes. Mr. Crissman noted that we would have to do the maintenance on it. Mr. Seeds explained like the Township does for any other street. Mr. Seeds noted that their driveways would be more private. Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Staub is a creative person and Mr. Wolfe should tell him that the Board did not like the design and it will not work, specifically, for maintenance issues for Public Works in regards to snow

removal and other road issues. He needs to come up with a better design. He noted that we are not asking for a cul-de-sac but a better way to design the entrance way. Mr. Crissman suggested that he may want to talk to our staff.

Mr. Miller noted even if the Township had a dedicated snow easement he did not see any place to put it as all the driveways come to a small point and the blades are 12 feet wide. He noted that is a big width of snow that staff would be pushing at one swipe. He noted that you would have to go back into their yards as you would be coming off at an angle until you can clear the 12 feet plus the snow.

Mr. Crissman noted that we need to get all the parties together to come up with a good solution and compromise.

Discussion regarding the Township's ability to  
form a municipal authority for stormwater facilities

Mr. Hawk noted that it is the shortest piece of legislation that he has seen in a long time. He noted that it gives the Township the authority to establish an authority but it has nothing in it to explain how we bill and all those kinds of things. Mr. Stine explained that information is already in the Authorities Act.

Mr. Stine noted that the charging part is already within the existing Authorities Act, as it says under their powers that they can levy rates and charges to administer, build and maintain their projects. He noted that the stormwater items would be a project.

Mr. Crissman questioned what are the strengths and weaknesses of establishing an authority for such purpose.

Mr. Stine answered that the strengths are that you have an entity that can build, maintain, repair, and replace stormwater systems in the Township and can charge rates for that from essentially everyone in the Township. He noted that is good because now the Board has someone that can charge rates to maintain a system of pipes like the existing authority already maintains which is the sanitary sewer. Mr. Hawk noted that the question is do you charge every resident in the Township or by basin or... Mr. Stine noted that you can do it any number of ways as long as the rates are reasonable and uniform.

Mr. Stine noted for weaknesses, if the people don't pay it, you have the municipal lien act available to you. Mr. Blain noted that it is not like you can shut off their stormwater. Mr. Stine

noted that the lien act allows you to lien property if they don't pay. He questioned if it was available to the Township as it only allows several things, taxes, sewer and water and abatement of a nuisance. He noted that we have done that in the Township for people who have junk all over their property.

Mr. Stine noted that it is not taxes, but the question is, is it sewer as was contemplated by the Act. He noted that it may or may not be... Mr. Crissman stated, until it is tested in the court... Mr. Stine noted that the Township may not be able to collect funds very efficiently.

Mr. Hawk noted that he lobbied to get a stormwater municipal authority established and kept running into dead ends. He noted that billing is the basic question as you have to have sufficient money to do what you need to do without creating a penalty that is harmful to all of the residents. Mr. Stine noted that the Township already has the model for that type of thing as the Sewer Authority already does it so you need to figure out your costs for the system and split it up among all those people who were benefiting from it. He noted that is the way it is done, but the bigger mystery is being able to collect.

Mr. Seeds noted when you say "those who benefit" unlike the sewer where most people have a sewer line to their homes; could you charge everyone or do you have to be near a stream or an area that is in the flood zone. Mr. Miller noted that it is a plot assessment for every parcel. He noted that everyone would get assessed since they are driving and achieving the benefit. He noted that the stormsewer helps protect life and property from further damage from the flooding so even if your home may not be directly affected, because you don't have a drain in front of your house, down the street at the corner, that area is protecting the integrity of the Township. He noted that he and Mr. Robbins have spent a lot of time looking into this, and are excited about the legislation. He noted that many municipalities have aerial photography shots of their entire municipality at a very high resolution, about six-inch resolution. He noted that we can see everything people have on their property such as patios and have it scaled to be dimensional. He noted for instance at the time the photography is taken in say June 2015 that Mr. Seeds has 2,000 square feet and Mr. Crissman has 2,200 square feet. He noted once all that information is received, then staff would come up with a EDU system, stating that a normal household size for the municipality is between 1,800 and 3,000 square feet and that an EDU is 3,000 square feet, so everyone from that point and under pays one fee; however, as soon as you are over that amount

of square footage, they would have to pay the first fee and if they are over the first fee they would be assessed on a percentage based upon how much overage they have. He noted that is the most fair way to do it and it is relatively simple to do. He noted that the aerial has to be paid for and there could be benefit of scale as Dauphin County would be good to work with if the Township would state that it wants something flown at a different scale and enough municipalities requested the same thing from the County. He noted that Dauphin County has the entire County flown on a regular basis every five years. He noted if enough municipalities went to them they could change their flight to make it available and there would be cost sharing as more people would be lumping into it. He noted that it affects everyone because churches and schools create stormwater. He noted that they pay no taxes at this time; however they are generating this issue and they would be included.

Mr. Hawk noted that he has talked about these things with Mr. Robbins and Mr. Miller for more than six months. He questioned if everyone should be billed a nominal fee. Mr. Miller answered that it will be looked at as a tax and suggested that it could be a user fee or an offset as the money is coming out of their pocket and he understands that. He noted that the stormsewer system will at some point, be in the same shape that the sanitary system is in. He noted that it was all nice and pretty when it was put in the ground and wonderful for a bunch of years but no one has seen it deteriorate. He explained that you see paint peeling on your house and shingles falling off your roof but you don't see the pipes underground going to pot. He noted that we are in a similar situation as we have 5,600 inlets and 75 miles of pipe so even if you looked at ten years, 50% of the pipe will be in bad shape, and staff only replaces 100 feet a year. He noted in a good year for stormsewer projects, staff might put in 2,000 feet but we are talking about 75 miles. He noted that this would allow staff to get a handle on the upcoming repairs that they will have.

Mr. Seeds questioned if anyone in Pennsylvania has ordinances that established this. Mr. Miller suggested that Jonestown had one long before the law was in effect. Mr. Seeds questioned if it was legal. Mr. Miller answered that he did not know if they were challenged but they had it and they were working with it. He noted that other states have had it for years.

Mr. Stine noted because it is an authority you would need to adopt a resolution. He noted that the Township already has an authority so it doesn't have to create one, it can amend its articles of incorporation to give it the power to do stormwater under the new act.

Mr. Hawk questioned if it would be separate billing or would it be included it in...Mr. Wolfe noted that is something that the Board would have to discuss. Mr. Stine noted that there is a lot of crafting that has to be done. Mr. Wolfe noted that you don't just put a resolution on the agenda and think that you are under way. He noted that it is a fairly big process, a big step to take.

Mr. Miller noted that there would be ways for people to get credits if they install a rain barrel, noting that they sound great in practice but most people never use the water so they only collect 50 gallons a year and all the rest overflows and goes down their driveway. He noted that it is only good if you use the water. He noted that they can get credit for putting in impervious areas or rain gardens. He noted that most of the credit applications that he has seen never fully get out of paying some fee. He noted if the Township charges a fee is \$6 every quarter, and if a person does one or two of these credits, the fee maybe cut by 25% or 30%. He noted that is the stuff that needs to be worked out.

Mr. Seeds noted if we would amend the sanitary sewer authority to include stormwater and we went from \$120 a quarter to \$130, they would be paying an extra \$10 a quarter but if they had a storm problem and we had a lot rain and they were flooded, they would want us to come out and fix it because they are paying money. He noted that it would be an immediate problem.

Mr. Miller noted that he does not see it as a problem. Mr. Seeds noted that it would take years to accumulate the money to do all the work that we need to do. Mr. Miller stated that he does not see that as a problem but more as an educational issue. He noted that the Township has millions of dollars of infrastructure, noting that it is the same thing that you went through with the fire trucks. He noted that you have x amount of stuff that is broken or will be broken so for Mrs. Jones to call and say that she has flooding problem and just paid \$4 last quarter and that she wants the Township to do something about it; there would have to be an inventory, costs for the repairs and staff would need to create a long term plan and so much work would be done each year. He noted that it is more of an education issue.

Mr. Seeds noted that the Board discussed when it gets land development plans, they have impervious areas, and we could charge a developer for impervious areas and they would get credits if they put certain things in the plan. Mr. Miller noted for new plans it is easy because we can tell them to define the storm water, but even six months after someone buys a home they are putting a pool in or a patio or adding a deck. He noted that it will require maintenance and a new study will have to be flown at a somewhat regular basis. He noted that the Board will have to draw the line in the sand to come up with a snapshot in time that this is what we have for impervious and then you can move forward from that.

Mr. Stine noted that there will be many iterations for how this can be. He noted that you could charge commercial different from residential and all kinds of things and set up different rate groupings, but you will need someone to evaluate all the different methods to determine what the best one is that costs the least amount of money for the Township to administer.

Mr. Hawk suggested that \$3 a month would be good and Mr. Miller suggested \$6 a quarter. Mr. Stine noted that right now it is just a number and it doesn't mean anything.

Mr. Crissman noted that the discussion is if we want an authority or not. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is not even that as he was providing information that you can do it if you want. He noted if you have an authority you have a different way to finance the improvement than you have now which is tax dollars. He noted that you could finance it through user fees and that is the benefit of an authority and it would separate the stormwater improvements out from the general fund and put it into its own fund like the sanitary sewer. He noted that you can charge however you want, a flat fee similar to how it is done with the sanitary sewer. He noted that people charge on water consumption or rate group but we charge a flat rate for everything. He noted that you need to have a consultant assist you with how you would form this as it is a big undertaking.

Mr. Wolfe questioned if the Board wants to consider it at this point and talk to some people to find out how it would form an operating authority for stormwater. Mr. Crissman questioned if we could look at other municipalities that have done this and get feedback from them. Mr. Wolfe answered not in Pennsylvania. He noted that the only ones who have done it in this state have done it under the current legislation as a combined sanitary sewer/stormsewer system which is permitted. Mr. Crissman noted that there is no past practice. Mr. Wolfe

answered, not in this state. He noted that you could look out of state but they are operating under different regulations.

Mr. Crissman questioned what the advantage to having an authority is. Mr. Wolfe answered that the primary advantage is an alternate source of funding for stormwater improvements that can be assessed to every property in the Township as opposed to real estate tax dollars or earned income tax dollars.

Mr. Seeds noted that the bottom line would be that it would offset the tax revenues that we are currently getting, so it could be a wash. He noted that right now, the money that we get we are spending, and that is coming from general taxation. Mr. Stine noted that you are not considering that when you do this, whoever the authority is, the first thing they will do is a bond issue for many millions of dollars that they can spend over a three-year period of time, noting that they will not spend \$200,000 a year. They will be spending millions in a year so it will not be a wash. Mr. Seeds noted if you float a bond you will have to pay it back over a period of years. Mr. Stine answered yes, but it is not a wash because now the Township is only spending a couple hundred thousand or so a year, but this is going to be millions a year if the authority does it so there is no way it can be a wash. Mr. Seeds suggested that we are spending closer to a million a year, and people's taxes had to be raised.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board has already issued a 2012 bond partly for stormsewer and a 2013 general obligation bond partially for stormsewer improvements and you have a program in place for three more years to expend those bond funds. He noted as we come to budget this year we will be looking at where that program is, how many projects it will take into account and also consider the fact that you have a large list of projects that we have not accepted responsibility for. He noted they are the undedicated public area and staff is taking the position that it is on private property at this time and much is in need of repair or has failed. He noted that we don't have that on the list. He noted that it is a significant issue and if you want to do it you will need a consulting engineer and help and he suggested that we will need a rate consultant as well.

Mr. Stine noted when we go to undertake this; the first problem that we will encounter is that much of the system is not dedicated to the Township and how do we work on it. He noted for many of the right-of-way issues, there are no owners and he questioned, how do we acquire

them because the authority will have to acquire them in order to be able to do work on them. He noted, in a development where there is a bunch of sewer easements nobody owns them, you have to get everyone in the development to sign off to convey it to the authority or you may have to condemn it.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board has done that with sanitary sewer system where there are public lines in existing right of ways that have not been dedicated and we have had to acquire them.

Mr. Seeds noted that we have always been a leader in Pennsylvania, especially in the area of parks, and he thinks that we should move forward. He noted that we should find someone to help the Township. Mr. Hawk agreed. Mr. Wolfe suggested that the first person to talk to at this time is Jeff Wendle as he has a good understanding for how authorities work but also a good understanding for general engineering. He stated that he would schedule Mr. Wendle for a discussion session.

Mr. Crissman noted that you have introduced the concept to the Board and he would like to be able to talk to various people and to bring in the best resources that we have to get good data before the Board is ready to make a decision to move forward.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he is suggesting Mr. Wendle not from a stormwater perspective as he works primarily with authorities. He noted that is not to say that HRG could not help out. He noted that they are doing similar work with the City of Harrisburg for both stormwater and sanitary sewer and they may be equally qualified but Mr. Wendle knows our setup and can start initial discussions. He noted that he may not be the person that you want to do this but at least we can have a discussion.

Mr. Crissman noted that it would be a discussion about the value of having an authority, advantages, disadvantages, strengths and weaknesses. He noted that he needs to have that data before he could make a decision one way or the other.

Mr. Hawk noted that HRG has Russ McIntosh involved in the process.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would try to set that up for the next workshop session.

Improvement Guarantees

Spring Creek Hollows, Phase I A

An extension and 10% increase in a letter of credit with Peoples Bank, in the amount of \$83,241.94, with an expiration date of September 10, 2014.

Willow Brook, Phases V & VI

An extension and 10% increase in a letter of credit with Fulton Bank, in the amount of \$89,564.50, with an expiration date of September 10, 2014.

Kendale Oaks, Phases II & III

An extension and 10% increase in a letter of credit with M&T Bank, in the amount of \$247,869.41, with an extension date of September 10, 2014.

Amber Fields, Phase IV

An extension and 10% increase in a letter of credit with Mid Penn Bank, in the amount of \$94,392.10, with an extension date of September 10, 2014.

Bishop McDevitt High School

An extension in a letter of credit with PNC Bank, in the amount of \$31,584.63, with an extension date of September 10, 2014.

Schiavoni LTD/Monticello

An extension in an escrow with Lower Paxton Township, in the amount of \$65,884.50, with an extension date of September 10, 2014.

Mr. Blain made a motion to approve the six improvement guarantees. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Blain seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved by,

Maureen Heberle  
Recording Secretary

Gary A. Crissman  
Township Secretary