

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop May 13, 2014

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

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

Also in attendance was George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steve Stine, Township Attorney; Public Safety Director David Johnson, Officer Chad Miller; and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mrs. Lindsey led in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public Comment

Mr. Mitch Tillett, 4965 Montclair Court, located in Colonial Club Drive, noted that he has lived at that home since 1993 continuously. He noted that he is present in regards to sewer service to his home and an address change. He explained that his name is William Mitchell Tillett and his son is William Maxwell Tillett. He noted that his son lived with him up until the early part of January of 2011 at which time he moved out and filed a change of address with the post office. He noted that the post office forwarded his son's mail and his mail to the new address at 1253 South Market Street. He noted that it is an address that he does not go to or live at, although he had to go there on several occasions to pick up his mail until he was able to remedy the situation.

Mr. Tillett noted since April of 2011 his sewer bills were continuously sent to the Market Street address. He noted that they were not paid as he had no idea that the bills were not coming in. He explained that he spoke to Mr. Hornung about this matter and Mr. Hornung questioned him if he was not aware that he was not receiving his bills. He noted that his right hand up to God that he was not aware that he was not receiving the bills. He noted that he is guilty of that noting that he should have been aware of it.

Mr. Tillett explained that the Sewer Department continuously tried to collect his sewer account for four years at the Market Street address. He noted that the bills were being sent back to the Sewer Department, unable to deliver. He noted on the 20th of March there was a notice posted to his front door and that got his attention that he owed over \$2,000 for his sewer bill. He noted that he was very grateful for the Township to provide the service during that period of time. He noted that he was dismayed at how he could continue to receive services for four years without paying a bill. He noted that he came to the Township and found that they made numerous attempts to collect at the 1253 South Market Street address, an address that he never lived at, but they never once during that period of time tried to collect at the address that he resided at. He noted that every other service provider that he does business with are current noting that they continued to provide service to him. He noted that he filed a correcting change of address to get his mail service at the post office.

Mr. Tillett noted that he wants to pay the bill and the total bill that was posted on his door on March was \$2,098.75. He explained that it is roughly \$600 in penalties and costs for collection. He noted that he already paid \$1,000 towards the bill. He noted that he feels he has some responsibility in this matter in terms of negligence but he does not feel that he has earned the responsibility entirely himself. He noted that he is a businessman, practiced insurance and financial services for 28 years with New York Life. He noted that he has dealt with people and he would have never rendered services for four years without receiving payment. He noted that he would have attempted to collect other than four years of not successfully being able to collect.

Mr. Tillett noted that the Township, specifically the Sewer Department has some part to play, the fact that these bills went unpaid; he is appealing to the Board to see if there is a way to get this matter resolved in such a way that he does not have to burden the full responsibly for the collection and the late fees. He noted that the quarterly bills are approximately \$1,600, of which he paid \$1,000, and \$650 is late fees and collection fees.

Mr. Tillett noted that after he paid \$1,000 and came into the Township, the last thing that he said to Natalie was to please correct his address. He noted that he did get a bill in the mail and since the matter had not been fully resolved in his mind he sent a check in for current services and the check was returned to him. He explained that it opened up his eyes since the bill was not correct. He noted that the bill that was sent to him did not reflect the \$1,000 that he paid. He noted that it was a boondoggle in his eyes. He noted that yesterday he got another bill and that

bill was incorrect as well. He noted that the Board could interpret this anyway it wants to but there is something going on with regard to the way the Township collects it fees. He noted that it doesn't seem fair that he could get away without paying for services for four years and other citizens are paying their bills on time. He noted if a notice would have been stuck on the door, even a year after delinquent service, which in his opinion would have been too long..., this matter would have been remedied a long time ago. He noted that he is looking for some type of closure on this matter and a way that he can get this resolved.

Mr. Hawk questioned, if you provided this information to the Township. Mr. Tillett answered yes, noting that he sat down with Bill Weaver and reviewed it with him, and with Natalie who works in the Sewer Department and he also spoke with the Modern Recovery. He noted that he lost a gasket the first time he spoke with Modern Recovery and has since apologized. He mentioned this because when he spoke to them, they would not hear anything of what he just explained to the Board, as their remedy was if it is not paid in ten days they will shut down the service.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Tillett has provided a lot of information and that the Board has to sit down with staff to go over this information. He noted that we cannot solve your problem now and will get back to you in a reasonable period of time. Mr. Tillett noted that his shutoff date is May 16th for the water service. He questioned if anything could be done at the Department level to postpone it. He noted that he does not have a problem paying for the services and we can squabble about the late fees. He noted that he is looking for some relief for the late fees and more importantly he wants to bring to the Board's attention that there seems to be something in the collection of the Sewer Department that doesn't meet normal business protocol.

Mr. Hawk noted that the Board will take a look at the situation and get back to Mr. Tillett.

Mr. Crissman questioned if staff has all the information that Mr. Tillett referenced. Mr. Wolfe answered yes.

Presentation regarding the use of canines in law enforcement

PSD Johnson introduced Officer Chad Miller who is the resident expert on canines in the Department, to discuss the possibility of starting a canine unit in the Police Department. He noted that he and Officer Miller put together a Power Point Presentation to provide some of the

highlights for what it would take to start a canine unit. He noted that he also supplied additional information for the Board members to read. He explained that he would be glad to answer any questions that any Board members may have, but asked Officer Miller to review the presentation at this time.

Officer Miller explained that he wanted to provide information to the Board for why we need a Police K-9. He explained that the Township is the largest and busiest police agency in Dauphin County except for Harrisburg City Bureau of Police. He noted that the Department has called for a K-9 numerous times relying on other police departments; however, the most recent K-9 incident using the City of Harrisburg's dog Zeke resulted in putting the dog in jeopardy.

Officer Miller noted that another reason for having a dog is due to the number of schools in the Township: Central Dauphin East High School, Central Dauphin Middle School, Central Dauphin East Middle School, Linglestown Middle School, Paxtonia, EH Phillips, Northside, Southside, Linglestown, Ridgeview, Vo-tech & alternative schools. He noted that most recently Bishop McDevitt High School opened in the Township. He noted that numerous times during the year, the police are called to take a team of dogs to search the schools for drugs. He noted that we are often assisted by Derry Township and Harrisburg City, and other K-9 units from other Counties to do these details.

Officer Miller noted that we have an extensive business community and often times officers are called for burglar alarms taking a team of officers a good deal of time to search buildings where a dog could clear these businesses for alarms or burglaries much faster and much safer. He noted something that may take several officers two to three hours to do may only take a dog one hour.

Officer Miller noted that all police departments spend much time in drug investigations as most of the crimes are somehow related to drugs. He noted that the canines could assist in traffic stops and searches of house to find where drugs are located. He noted if a canine smells drugs from outside the vehicle it would provide probable cause to search the vehicle. He noted that the dog could be used to recover evidence, as their sense of scent is 1,000 times better than human beings. He noted that the dog can track evidence that may have been discarded from the scene of a crime.

Officer Miller explained he received his information for costs from Castle's K-9 Inc. He noted that the basic breakdown to include a patrol and narcotics dog would be \$15,790. He noted

that the Department would obtain a dog that is no more than 36 months old with health and shot records, with a one-year health warranty and ninety-day warranty on work ability. He noted that a Narcotics and/or Patrol Dog would require attending a four (4) week school. He noted that explosives' training is a six (6) week school. He explained that the dog is introduced to the training first and then the officer is introduced at a later time. He noted that both schools include room and breakfast at the training facility as well as the 500 page training manual, National & school certifications, leather muzzle, scratch pants, sleeve with cuff, hidden sleeve, agitation harness, equipment bag, padded slog, water and feed bowls, leashes (6' & 30'), choke collar, and standard K9 Guardian vehicle insert including installation at training facility. He noted that each K-9 vehicle must have a special insert to protect the dog and handler to ensure that the dog does not get loose from the vehicle and to provide a safe environment for the dog when the officer is driving around the Township. He noted that Castle's would install the insert as part of its fee.

Officer Miller noted that there are additional costs: Food – Approximately \$500 per year; Vet Care – Approximately \$500 per year, with no major injuries/illnesses; Additional officer - \$70,000.00; Overtime - \$2,500.00; Take home vehicle approx. \$15,000.00 first year; required annual training – Approximately \$10,000.00; Uniforms \$400; Total First Year Costs are approximately \$114,690.00. He noted that this does not include any donations that would reduce the overall costs. He explained that he would look to see if he could get the food donated by area businesses as well as the Veterinarian care.

Officer Miller noted, once a K-9 Officer is added; the Department would have to replace him with another officer. PSD Johnson noted that we could not count the K-9 Officer for overall manpower requirements since many Departments allow the officer to leave one hour earlier as a mean of compensating him for the care of the dog. He noted that there will be call outs to other agencies and that is another reason why the officer could not be counted for manpower. He noted that there would be additional training that the officer and dog would have to undertake.

Officer Miller noted that the overtime is estimated to pay for call outs. He noted that the take home vehicle would be a patrol SUV that is currently being used and is outfitted with lights, sirens, etc. , but it would also include the gasoline and insurance as it would be a take home vehicle. PSD Johnson noted that the patrol supervisors use SUV and every three years they are rotated out of the fleet, with approximately 100,000 miles on them. He noted, in many instances,

they transfer to another fleet within the Township. He explained, if he uses one of the those vehicles someone would have to pay for the cost to replace that vehicle, noting that it would be a \$10,000 expense with the other \$5,000 covering gasoline, maintenance and insurance. Officer Miller noted that the reason for using a SUV would be that it has 4-wheel drive and would be able to access all locations, provide more room for the dog and the equipment that goes with being a dog handler.

Officer Miller noted that the required annual training is approximately \$10,000 a year. He explained that \$1,800 is for on-going training noting that once you are certified there are annual updates and training that is necessary. He noted that the dog must go through a yearly certification process. He noted that the remaining funds are for him to attend the training. He noted that the cost of uniforms would be \$400 as they must be easy to wash as the officer would typically get dirty working with a dog.

Officer Miller noted that the total annual cost is \$114,690. PSD Johnson explained for many police departments, local business groups, civic associations and others help to pay the costs for the dog. He noted that this is the worst case scenario for costs.

Officer Miller noted that it is essential that the dog have a ballistic vest. Mrs. Lindsey noted that the wife of Officer Gallup, who died seven years ago, would like to raise the funds for the vest by hosting a spaghetti dinner in his memory. Officer Miller explained that he has not seen any police department that was unable to raise the funds for a vest.

Mr. Hornung questioned what other municipalities in the area have K-9 units. Officer Miller answered in Dauphin County it is Derry Township and the City of Harrisburg. He noted that the other departments, Susquehanna and Swatara Townships have disbanded their canine units and not replaced them. He noted that Derry Township is the most experienced canine department in the area as they continually have reputable officers and canines who are assigned. He noted that they sponsor fundraisers to help pay the costs for the dogs.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that those communities raise funds for these dogs and the Township borrows them at the communities' expense. She explained that she had discussed this with PSD Johnson for how we are using these dogs that have been paid for by other communities, especially when you look at all that goes into the training. She noted look at what happened to Zeke, the police dog, in our own Township. She noted that it is something we need to think

seriously about, especially since we are the largest Township in Dauphin County except for Harrisburg City and we have the most schools in the County as well.

Mr. Seeds questioned what a pad slot is. Officer Miller answered that a slot is the equipment for a bite sleeve, padded equipment that you would wear to allow the dog to bite you so you don't get injured.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there would be additional liability insurance needed for the Police Department. PSD Johnson answered those extra costs are not included in the costs provided as he would have to get a quote from the insurance company and he has not done that yet.

Mr. Hornung questioned if you have to insure the dog in case it is injured. PSD Johnson noted that there is an option to insure the dog for the cost of the training and the purchase of the dog but the main insurance coverage the Township would need would be liability insurance for both the suspect and an innocent bystander.

Mr. Seeds questioned, when the Township borrows dogs do we reimburse the departments, and if we had our own dog would we expect reimbursement for our department. PSD Johnson answered at this time, there is no reimbursement as it has been treated as a mutual aid request for the departments over the years. He noted that he recently had a discussion with another Police Chief and we have discussed that option. He noted that it was something they were going to discuss at the Dauphin County Chiefs of Police Association meeting; however, at this time no one is billing anyone for any services.

Mr. Seeds noted that the Department had a dog many years ago. PSD Johnson answered that retired Sergeant Ed Hyde had a dog and once the dog was retired he kept the dog until it died. He noted that the average working life for a dog is six to nine years.

Mr. Crissman noted that he remembered when Sgt. Hyde brought the dog to the Central Dauphin and Central Dauphin East High Schools. He noted that he was able to schedule both the Pennsylvania State Police and Township dogs to search both schools at the same time. He noted that you had to do both schools at the same time or the word would get out to the other school.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the proposal is to start with only one dog. PSD Johnson answered yes. Mr. Crissman noted that it would cost at least \$130,000. PSD Johnson explained that the \$114,690 includes the cost of the dog and is a projected cost at this time. Mr. Wolfe noted that one item that is not listed and should be listed is the compensation for the additional

police officer as well as the benefits costs. He noted if the Board wants to consider this it would need to be added to the total costs.

Mr. Crissman noted that a correction needs to be made to the Power Point in that you are missing comas in the figures for the cost of overtime and take home vehicle approximate costs. He noted that Ridgeview is not a school in the Township as it should be Mountain View Elementary School.

Mr. Crissman questioned if Cassel's K-9 is owned by Chief Cassel as he used to borrow his dogs from York County years ago for the schools. PSD Johnson answered that it is the same person.

Mrs. Lindsey suggested that this would be a great way for the community to get involved and good PR for Lower Paxton Township as well. Mrs. Lindsey questioned if Officer Miller was willing to be a handler. Officer Miller answered yes. He noted with the liability issue, he stated, one of the keys to keeping it at its lowest cost is the training and getting the dog from a reputable dealer as well as the ongoing training for the dog and handler. He noted that you must keep up on the paperwork and certifications.

Mr. Hawk questioned why the dogs come from Europe. Officer Miller answered that he did not know other than that is where Chet Cassel buys his dogs from. He noted that most dogs are pre-selected by Cassel and his team and brought to the United States, noting that sometimes they have a dog on hand but other times, they have to go select the dog. Mr. Hawk noted that the Belgian Malinois is gaining a tremendous amount of popularity. Officer Miller explained that a handler explained to him that the German Sheppard is more like a Cadillac and the Belgian Malinois is more like a Ferrari. He explained that he was told that the Malinois is a very high end dog for work and home care, constantly wanting to work. He noted that their life span is a little longer as they are a small dog and they don't have the problems that the German Sheppard have with hips dysplasia. He noted that they have much more energy so there can be an issue that they are harder to train. He noted that the Sheppard is the choice for first-time handlers. He explained that Derry Township uses the Sheppard's. Mr. Hawk noted that Zeke was a Malinois. Officer Miller suggested that the City of Harrisburg has a mix of dogs.

Mr. Seeds noted that the dogs can be used to search for an elderly person suffering from dementia. He noted that the dogs are trained so that their behavior when they find who they are searching for will be different depending on whom they are searching for. Officer Miller noted,

for the majority of time that a dog is tracking a person, the handler is with the dog using a leash, but when they are searching inside a building for an alarm situation, the leash may be removed. He noted that most dogs are trained to search with a leash so once they find the person they will not necessarily be aggressive. Mr. Seeds noted that the handler has to let the dog lead him. Officer Miller noted that in some circumstances they may be searching for children, mentally ill, or elderly people who wander away.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that most of the dogs are males.

Mr. Hornung questioned how many dogs Derry Township has. Officer Miller answered four but he is not sure if they are all being used. He noted that they have at least two or three in service.

Mr. Hornung questioned if we purchased a dog would there be more forfeiture funds available due to finding more drugs. PSD Johnson answered that it is a possibility, as the Department might be involved in more drug related incidents such as drugs in cars or money associated with drugs in cars that we currently are unable to find now.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the frequency of dog use for the Department is limited due to the availability of dogs and would it increase. He questioned, in the beginning, could we share the use of the dog with another Township and split the time and cost. PSD Johnson answered that we have not discussed this but we could explore those options. He noted in his discussions with Chief Martin, he is not interested in getting a dog, so they might be interested. Mr. Wolfe noted, sharing an animal is one thing, but the dog reports to one handler and it would be very difficult to share the police officer that the dog reports to except on an as needed basis for like we have done with the City of Harrisburg and Derry Township. He noted that sharing a dog would result in problems with personnel that would be difficult to address. PSD Johnson noted that we could not give the dog off to another officer as it is assigned to one handler.

Mr. Hornung questioned how the Department gets the use of a dog. Mr. Wolfe answered that it comes with the officer. Mr. Hornung questioned why we could not work a reimbursement agreement where Susquehanna Township would reimburse the Township for the use of the dog and handler for 50% of the costs. Officer Miller noted that the Township has borrowed dogs from Derry, Swatara and Susquehanna Townships and the City of Harrisburg in the past, free of charge, and if we were to do that now and charge these departments when the Township was getting the dogs free...Mr. Seeds questioned how often the Department borrows a dog. Officer

Miller noted that the numbers are low and we only do it when there is a real need as we take that dog from someone else who may need the dog. He suggested that we have used a dog three to five times so far this year but that is not to say that we would have used a dog more if it would have been readily available.

Mr. Seeds suggested that it would be a huge benefit to the school district for policing activities. He noted that the school district has their own problems and suggested that they could be a source of financial assistance. Mr. Crissman noted that he never had to pay for the use of dogs.

Mr. Hornung questioned if there are certain drugs that the dogs cannot sniff. Officer Miller answered that the only thing they can't sniff may be prescription drugs. He noted that they can sniff all of the illegal drugs.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the Police Department had any information for drug arrests for when dogs were used heavily that drug dealing in an area decreased. PSD Johnson answered that the Police Department does not have those statistics but he would be glad to check with other agencies that have dogs. He noted that there are many instances when the Department has asked for a dog from another agency but no one was working at the time.

Mr. Seeds noted that he would like to see a list with the pro's and con's for purchasing a dog for the residents. Officer Miller answered that one benefit would be with the increase in the use of heroine that the EMS are using Naloxone to prevent deaths. He noted that the Central Pennsylvania area is the second highest in the nation for heroine overdoses. He noted if the dog can save a few lives by taking heroine or other drugs off the street it is well worth it.

Mr. Hornung questioned if a resident could call to have his house searched for drugs. PSD Johnson answered that is not something we would want to get into and the Department must be very careful with doing searches in homes. He suggested that we should not be doing that.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned what if the schools called. PSD Johnson answered that is a different situation.

Mr. Hornung questioned what dogs find in the schools. Officer Miller answered that they have a team of canines from different jurisdiction come in to inspect the halls and lockers. He noted that they don't want the students to know ahead of time, and typically the dog finds something in a few lockers. He noted that majority of finds came from cars parked in the school lot. Mr. Hornung suggested that it would help to prevent drugs from coming into the schools. Mr.

Crissman explained that we would clear the halls having all the students in classroom and normally they have two dogs walk down the halls along the lockers. He noted that dogs have identified things other than drugs as well.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that Officer Miller did a great presentation and it is something that the Township really needs. She noted in talking to people in the community over the past couple of months, they are happy to help and want to be a part of this.

Review of a proposed ordinance prohibiting
the parking of vehicles on unpaved surfaces

Mr. Wolfe explained that he prepared a draft ordinance for discussion purposes as it is not the final form for the ordinance. He explained that it is an amendment to the property maintenance code to prohibit vehicle parking on grass, lose stone areas of any premises, requiring people to park on paved asphalt, concrete or brick and stone pavers. He noted that several Board members felt it was a much needed ordinance but there are issues. He noted, not knowing what the Board is looking for he brought it in this draft form to find out specifically what the Board is looking to do.

Mrs. Lindsey noted what she would like to see is that people would not be permitted to park on their front lawn in residential areas. She explained that she experiences this in her own development and so does Mr. Hawk. She noted that allowing people to park on their lawns will decrease property values. She explained when residents put their homes up for sale; buyers don't want to buy a home where people park in their front lawns. She explained that she has noticed a change in the Township since 2008 and now is the time to try to clean some things up.

Mr. Crissman noted as the amendment is written it does not address only private property noting what happens at Central Dauphin Middle School when people park on the grass for football games. He noted at Stouffers on Mother's Day weekend, employees had to park on the grass as they did not have sufficient amount of parking available. He noted that he is not sure how to address this to encompass both situations.

Mr. Wolfe noted that staff has a concern for when someone is having a block party or graduation party and they are looking to park vehicles on their grass on a temporary basis. He noted that enforcement for temporary violations will be very problematic. He noted that most of the time, the temporary basis would occur on the weekends. He noted that he likes the idea of no parking in the front yard, and in residential areas as it narrows down the requirement.

Mr. Hawk noted that he agreed with Mrs. Lindsey's comments with the residential area and front yard. He noted when neighbors are having a party, they will come and ask to park in front of the house and usually that is granted but parking on the front lawn is another thing. Mrs. Lindsey noted when it is continuous... Mr. Hawk noted that it devalues the home and makes it look ugly.

Mr. Seeds noted that he was not aware that this was an issue as he never heard about this before. He noted that he parks his vehicles in the back by the garage off the alley on a stone area, one that is not paved on purpose because he wants it to be a pervious surface due to the runoff to prevent flooding. He noted that he understands the issue for parking on a front lawn. He explained that this ordinance states that you can't park in a stone area either. He noted that there are many people who don't have paved driveways or maybe they are paved a few feet in off the road. Mr. Wolfe noted that the ordinance requires that the first 50 feet must be paved. He noted for people with large properties, you may have a problem with this as a large property tends to park... if you have a five acre parcel you will see parking in the lawn area. He suggested that you may want to determine a size for a residential parcel, such as residential parcels up to an acre or less.

Mr. Crissman noted that we need to accommodate situations like football parking on grass; otherwise they will be in violation. Mr. Wolfe suggested that you would be okay if you limit it to residential areas as schools are institutional zoning. Mr. Crissman noted that it must say private residential property.

Mr. Seeds noted that we have a problem with vehicles all over the Township, noting that he could show you more than 100 vehicles within ten minutes of each other that are unlicensed and uninspected vehicles, cars that have been sitting rusting for years. He noted that he would rather clean that up than worry about someone who is parking on their lawn. He noted that we don't have the time and manpower to do it.

Mr. Hawk noted that he is fine with changing it to residential. Mr. Crissman noted that he is alright with it as long as it is for residential areas.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the changes are that the vehicles should not be parked in the front yard, only in residential areas, except for a driveway area or on a lot of one acre or less.

Mr. Hornung noted that his mother has ten kids and on Mother's Day we were parking all over the place and he had to park on her front lawn for that day. He noted that he ended up doing

that at Easter as well. He questioned how you rectify that. Mr. Wolfe noted that there are unintended consequences for this type of an ordinance.

Mr. Seeds noted that it reminded him of the noise ordinance. He noted that he did not know how to address Mr. Hornung's comment. He noted that the Township works on a complaint basis and it does not have enough staff to drive the Township looking for people parking their cars in the front yard. He noted if a neighbor is mad at his neighbor, they may use this as a means to get back at the neighbor, but they must be willing to testify in court. He noted that now, you have staff drug into a neighborhood conflict and the ordinance is being used as the club. Mr. Hornung noted that his mother did have a neighbor like that and we learned very quickly not to park in front of his yard as he was not happy with it.

Mr. Hornung noted that people have installed little pull offs and he received a complaint from someone about water running onto his pull off area as it was making it all muddy and we put a little berm there. He noted that he used this pull off area in front of his house, stoned it and he would park at that location. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is not a good thing because they expand the roadway, and when public works paves the road if they don't pave the road then the property owner gets made and if we do pave them it is more expensive and we don't have the stormwater facilities in place to accommodate them. He noted that it happens a lot in the older areas of the Township that do not have curbing.

Mr. Hornung questioned if we should also prohibit that use as well in this ordinance. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it would be worth consideration. He suggested that it would be more of a road maintenance issue then property maintenance code as you are talking about things that occur in a public right-of-way. He noted that they are expanding the cartway in the right-of-way without seeking permission. He noted that is something that he will make note of for future discussion for that ordinance.

Mr. Hornung questioned if there is a way to say that you couldn't park in your front yard more than once a week. Mr. Stine noted that it would be an enforcement problem. He noted that it could be proven by pictures that many times have dates and time. He noted that he is trying to separate occasional time from someone who parks their car in their front yard because they need to wash their car. He suggested that Mrs. Lindsey is looking at the car that is parked every day in the front yard. He questioned how you separate it out. He noted that the key is to separate those two issues and he questions if there is a way to separate it by frequency. Mr. Stine noted that

ordinances are difficult to enforce even when they are straight forward. He noted the more stuff you put in it, the less likely you will be able to enforce it.

Mr. Wolfe noted if you list a frequency, they will only park within the allowed frequency, especially if it is a neighbor against neighbor situation. Mr. Crissman noted if we put in a restriction for three hours and the car is parked more than three hours, then the neighbor will call.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he will prepare a second draft for the Board to review. He noted that it is worth further discussion at staff level and at Board level because we are looking to solve a problem that will have unintended consequences.

Mr. Hawk noted that he has a situation where it is not an occasional occurrence, as they regularly park on the lawn. Mr. Hornung noted that is what he is trying to get at, the regular occurrence for this. Mr. Hawk noted that it is four or five cars. Mr. Crissman noted that you are talking about the habitual person who parks their car on their front lawn. Mr. Hornung noted that is what you want to avoid.

Public Comment

Mr. Hornung explained that he told Mike and Gary Carl that they could address the Board at 7:30 p.m. forgetting that this meeting started at 6 p.m. He requested the Board to allow Public Comment at this time to allow Mike Carl to address the Board.

Mr. Mike Carl, 1281 Mountain Road, owner of Carl's Auto Body explained that he and his brother, Gary Carl, wanted to check on the zoning change that occurred to the back of the property as it used to be commercial but was rezoned to Village District. He noted that the front end of his property is zoned commercial. He noted when they went through the town and did all their stuff it was changed to Village. He explained that he wants to put a storage lot to the rear of his property but maybe it would be allowed in the Village District.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned Mr. Carl if he was notified when the rear property was rezoned. Mr. Carl answered no as he called into the Township to check on the development and the person laughed at how he could do that in the Village District.

Mr. Hornung noted when the Board did the Comprehensive Plan, a lot of land was rezoned and the people were not notified of it. He noted that they were notified of the meetings but to notify each specific person would have been very cumbersome. Mr. Stine explained when a Township does a new rezoning ordinance; it does not have to make notifications.

Mr. Hornung noted that he spoke to Mr. Carl earlier in the day and asked him to come to this meeting tonight. He explained that he has a line drawn down the center of his property and half was zoned Village and the other half was zoned Commercial, the front half where he has Carl's Auto Body Shop. He noted that he would like to be able to store some vehicles in the back section of the land and fence it in. He suggested to him that he may want to apply for a rezoning for his property or the Township could do it. He noted that since this is a workshop session he asked him to come in and talk to the Board.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Carl was sure that the land was zoned Village. Mr. Carl answered that when he called in to see what it was, he was told that the front half was commercial and the back half was Village. Mr. Seeds stated that he would have to look at the map as he was not aware of that. Mr. Carl noted that the property is on two deeds.

Mr. Crissman suggested that staff should verify the information as it would be easier for the Board to have a map showing the property so that we all know for certain exactly how it is. Mr. Wolfe noted that he could provide this information for the next Workshop meeting. Mr. Crissman suggested that is what we should do if it is acceptable to the other Board members.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Carl could meet with Ms. Moran. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Carl knows what the land is zoned. He stated that he would verify that and provide the Board with additional information. He noted that Ms. Moran will not tell him anything that he does not already know but the Board is looking for detailed information.

Mr. Hornung questioned Mr. Carl if he spoke with Mr. Moran. Mr. Carl answered that he did not know who he talked to as he called in one day and someone told him that you need to inquire to see what happened. He stated that he did not know that they did it all through town.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned Mr. Carl if his property was originally all commercial. Mr. Carl answered yes. Mrs. Lindsey noted now that it is split, the property value has changed. Mr. Crissman noted that we are not certain and we need to get the right information.

Mr. Seeds noted that we need to look at what the uses are for that property. Mr. Crissman noted that we all need to know what it is and what options can be taken that would be helpful. Mr. Wolfe noted that he will have this available for Mr. Carl for the next workshop session, the second Tuesday in June at 6 p.m.

Mr. Hornung suggested that Mr. Carl should sit down with Ms. Moran face-to-face and go over what he can do. Mr. Wolfe noted that we would be happy to do that. Mr. Crissman

noted that we would still address this during a workshop session as well. Mr. Wolfe explained that he would have the information for a workshop session. Mr. Hornung suggested that a meeting with Ms. Moran may resolve many of his issues.

Review of the Key Indicator Report for the 2013 fiscal year

Mr. Wolfe explained that the Key Indicator Report is a quarterly financial report provided to the Board however, this is the year-end document for 2013.

Mr. Wolfe noted in 2013, the General Fund (GF) which is the operating fund for general government purposes, was budgeted and balanced with revenues and expenditures of \$18,340,073. He noted that the GF ended up with revenues of \$19,126,007 and expenditures of \$17,936,767 providing a surplus of \$1,189,239. He noted that it is the second year where the Township has had a surplus and it is more significant than 2012, following five years where the Township had deficit spending situations where it drew upon its fund balance to meet operations. He noted that is contrary to Board policy, but given the National Economic Recession, and its effect locally, it was necessary to maintain services.

Mr. Wolfe noted the Township also received its annual allotment of State Aid Funds in the amount of \$1,014,787 used for maintenance of public streets and right-of-ways. He noted that the Township ended up with proposed expenditures of \$1,453,955 with the difference made up from prior year's balance. He noted that it produced a surplus of \$14,540. He explained that these funds are available to the Board for future allocation and can be used for anything that qualifies under State Aid Municipal Fuels Act.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the GF balance at the beginning of 2013 was \$5,998,255 and at the end of 2013, the Township had a balance of \$7.2 million which exceeded the Board's fund balance policy statement of providing 25% of annual expenditures in the account in case of an emergency.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the General Improvement Fund (GIF), which is the capital construction fund, had expenditures of \$1,619,478 for several items; the largest amount was for stormwater improvements.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there is a Fire Equipment Capital Fund which had a year-end balance of \$979,360. He explained that the fund was established to replace nine pieces of fire fighting apparatus operated by the three volunteer fire companies. He noted that the Board and

fire companies have been in discussion for Phase IV for the Fund spending program, noting that the three previous phases spent well over \$3 million in the purchase of fire fighting equipment.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Length of Service Awards Program (LOSAP) Fund Balance ended the year at \$379,973. He noted that it is a program that provides a stipend for fire fighters and fire police who meet specific criteria providing them with a thank you for their years of service as dedicated volunteers.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Friendship Center (FC) operating fund ended in a deficient as the Board is well aware. He noted that the budget amount was \$2,018,968 with a deficit of \$120,000. He noted that there is a Capital Fund balance of \$60,664 with a fund balance of \$3,097,012, including cash entries for depreciation of property. He noted that it is not really cash on hand; rather an auditor's entry to provide the value of the fund based upon appreciation and depreciation.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township Authority had revenues of \$17,120,527 and expenditures for operations of \$12,316,857. He explained that they undertook capitol projects that totaled \$13,671,785 and the Township is getting a taste of those projects here at the municipal center with most of the roads into this building torn up for sanitary sewer improvements. He noted that much of the Township has either experienced these improvements in the recent past or will be experiencing them in the near future. He noted that cash-on-hand by the Authority by the end of 2013 was \$22,977,547 for ongoing capital projects.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Police Pension Fund had a year-end balance of \$19,151,312 and the Non-Uniformed Employee Pension Fund had a balance of \$12,792,539. He noted that these are fiduciary funds which the Board manages on behalf of its full-time employees in specific bargaining groups of employment with the Township.

Mr. Wolfe noted that page six of the report shows that the General Fund summary of trends for each quarter but the actual change in information for this page is minimal. He noted that revenues in general for the GF for 2013 were 3% higher than in 2012 and exceeded the budget expectation. He noted that the rate of expenditure was only 2% higher than it was in 2012 and within budget parameters, making it more positive year-end in 2013 than in 2012.

Mr. Wolfe noted the chart for operations shows that between 2012 and 2013 budget and 2013 actual budget, the revenues have exceeded expenditures which is what the Board desires. He noted that the net assets in GF were \$7.2 million, and of that, a little more than \$200,000

were restricted assets. He noted that they are primarily Park and Recreation Fee-in-lieu funds with the rest being unrestricted assets.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the historic perspective for the year-end balance on page 11 is significant in that the Township relies in many instances on the fund balance to do capital projects and the fund balance for many years exceeded expenditures; therefore, the Board for a significant period of time was able to develop a very good savings account in excess of \$10 million for total general fund purposes. He noted in 2006 and through 2011, the expenditures far exceeded the revenues on an annual basis and the Board dipped into the GF balance not only for operations but for some planned capital projects in accordance with the five-year strategic plan. He noted that the fund balance fell from \$10 million to less than \$4 million. He noted that the Township has had some recovery of that amount but it is not yet at pre-recession levels for the fund balance. He noted that the fund is healthy, but not as well healed as it has been in the past. He noted that the FC, LOSAP, and Fire Equipment Capital Funds draw from this and that has impacted the Fund Balance. He noted that is what the savings account is for. He explained that the Board had planned draws on the fund balance from the past and they will continue into the future.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the State Aid Fund has a beginning balance of \$220,898 with \$1,046,092 in revenues, spending more than \$1,031,552 to provide a balance of \$235,438 that could be drawn upon at any time in the future for appropriate road maintenance projects. He noted, in addition to the annual allocation, which is a little more than one million dollars, the new state legislation is to provide additional transportation funding to municipalities, and as a result the Township will see that amount increase to between \$1.6 to \$1.7 million over the next five years. He noted that this fund primarily provides for blacktop for the roads, salt for the deicing, purchase of equipment to maintain the roads, and repair and maintenance of the traffic signals as well as the costs for labor for maintaining road facilities.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Fire Equipment Capital Fund balance is approaching \$1 million as \$200,000 would be added to it in 2014. He noted that continued discussions are ongoing with the fire fighters for Phase IV of the Fire Equipment Capital Fund. He noted that the Board has done deficit purchasing for fire apparatus in the past where it took the money that it had and applied it to a total purchase which is greater than what it had on account and then recouped the

remaining amount in future years, taking allocations back to the GF from a loan that it made to the Fire Equipment Capital Fund.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the LOSAP provides fire fighters with more than 25 years of service as a volunteer, to earn a monthly stipend at age 65 of \$250. He noted that the year started with a balance in the fund of \$296,000 and ended with a balance of \$379,973. He noted that the Board did increase its annual contribution to the LOSAP from \$60,000 to \$76,000 in 2013. He noted that Mr. Seeds noticed in his review of the report that we had significant earnings over and above the \$76,000 and he questioned what composed those earnings. He explained that the plan had interest earnings of \$4,000, and a gain on investments of nearly \$6,000 producing an unrealized gain on investment, of almost \$24,000. He noted that both pension plans had annual earnings in excess of 15% and the LOSAP also had significant earnings as well.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the GIF provides for capital projects and last year nearly \$ 1 million was spent on stormwater improvements, Wolfersberger Park Plan, Financial Management System at \$120,000, the roof on the Municipal Center was replaced for \$275,000 and new Public Works radios were purchased costing \$100,000. He noted that some improvements, especially the stormwater improvements, were paid for by bonds issued in 2013.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that the Village of Linglestown shows that nothing was budgeted but \$16,000 was spent. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it was carry over costs from the project close out with reimbursements going back and forth from PennDOT. He noted that he would check on it. Mrs. Lindsey questioned if it had anything to do with the roundabout. Mr. Wolfe answered that anything listed as a Linglestown item has been for the roundabout project.

Mr. Hornung noted that Community Development overspent \$110,000. He questioned what that was for. Mr. Wolfe answered that it would be for engineering and review fees for building and developer fees that are offset in large part by those incurring the costs. Mr. Hornung noted that the revenues were up by \$93,000. Mr. Wolfe noted that in the past where we had 40 to 50 building permits for new single –family units, it was 75 for last year. He noted that we are not back to pre-recession levels but we had a better year than the last five years.

Mr. Crissman noted that it looks like we are climbing out of the basement. Mr. Wolfe noted that we were, but it has leveled off again. He noted, in the Estates of Forest Hills, the Home-A-Roma Development building permits were issued last year for several extremely large and high value homes that we typically don't get, homes costing between \$800,000 to \$1 million.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the revenues include bond proceeds. Mr. Wolfe answered that bond proceeds are only listed when they are drawn upon and that would be in the GIF. He noted that it would be a budgeted source of revenue. He noted if we have a \$4 million bond and we are spending \$1 million this year, we will have a budget allocation of \$1 million of 2014 bond proceeds to be spent in the fiscal year. He noted that it is shown as revenue.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the Township only put \$200,000 in the FECP. Mr. Wolfe answered that the number was higher at \$250,000 but in discussions with the fire company when we instituted the LSOAP program it was agreed upon by the all fire departments that the FECP was healthy enough to take the \$50,000 from it and add some from Township funds to fund the LOSAP.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Township was almost \$1.2 million over in 2013 in revenues over expenses... Mr. Wolfe noted that is without bond expenses.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the FC and LPTA are quasi-business operations that stand alone from municipal operations and tax dollars. He noted that the FC operates on revenue it generates itself on \$2 million budget with a \$100,000 allocation from the Township to be used for housing Parks and Recreation facilities. He noted that the Authority is a much larger operation with an annual budget of \$13 million for expenditures operating through a management agreement with Lower Paxton Township the Township's sanitary sewer system.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the FC had a deficit of \$125,000. He noted that the Board is well aware of this and is working to address ongoing improvements to the FC.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Authority has a much larger budget but the most important part of this is that last year it spent \$14 million in ongoing capital improvements to its system and he has provided a list of the contracts that have been under management by the Authority in the past year. He noted that these are very large construction contracts, multi-year in nature, ranging anywhere from \$3.8 million to \$6 million. He noted that the Authority has five contracts in management at this time.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the pension funds for both police and non-uniformed employees had a good year with both funds earning more than 15% in growth.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the net loss for the FC was just 2012 and 2013 or was there more prior to that. Mr. Wolfe answered that he would have to look that up. Mr. Hornung answered that there was but he did not remember the numbers.

Summary of the ranking of items from the Strategic Plan brainstorming session

Mr. Wolfe explained that he included the results of the Strategic Plan (SP) from the special workshop session that was held recently. He noted that the Board would need to have another workshop session to focus on putting together the SP in final form; however, he requested the Board to review the list of items for future discussions to determine if it is complete or if there are other items you would like to throw on the table for consideration. He requested the Board to look at how it ranked the items to determine if it is comfortable with how the ranking has occurred.

Mr. Wolfe noted that it is colored by Department and it also has the list of the top ten projects. He noted that they are as follows: 1) Hiring of additional police officer, increasing the compliment from 52 to 56 officers over the five year period; 2) Stormwater management program; 3) Hire an additional codes enforcement officer in the Community Development Department; 4) Public Works building improvement project which you have borrowed for in the recent \$7 million portion of a \$32 million bond issue that was closed in the last couple of weeks; 5) Hire a public works operation supervisor; 6) Continued investment in IT at the Township level; 7) Fill site for the Wolfersberger Park which is a joint project in conjunction with the Authority projects, taking clean fill from those projects and using it to level areas in the front section of the park; 8) Fire Services Study; 9) Replacement of existing parks and recreation equipment; and 10) Replace the in-car computers for police officers by providing the officers with tablets.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he provided this to the Board for their continued review and to schedule another meeting in the near future to put this portion of the project to bed.

Mr. Hornung requested a sheet that shows the ranking from top to bottom. Mr. Wolfe answered that he would do that for the Board members

Status of the proposed I-83 expansion project from Union Deposit Road North to I-81

Mr. Wolfe noted that staff met with representatives from PennDOT and their consultants in regard to the proposed I-83 expansion from Union Deposit Road North to the Interchange of I-83 and I-81. He noted that it will effect Lower Paxton Township since that stretch of road is within the community and also the Colonial Park interchange and the interchange at I-83 at Union Deposit Road as well as construction at the split with I-83 and I-81.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the plan is prepared to the point where PennDOT knows what properties will be effected and how they will be effected. He explained that he has not been told any information for the specific residential properties that will be required for acquisition as those plans are still progressing. He noted that there is a minor effect on one commercial property that also will need to be worked out by PennDOT.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the construction will probably begin in phases with interchange work being undertaken first and then once that is completed then they will move to the extension of the roadway itself. He noted from what he has seen on the plan it will not be a project without significant pain for PennDOT, the Township, and motoring public. He noted that it will be multi-years in phases and it will cause disruption of traffic patterns.

Mr. Wolfe noted that PennDOT is requesting two items from the Township. He noted that PennDOT is looking to install sidewalks on Union Deposit Road at the interchange from East Park Drive to Briarsdale Road and on the Colonial Road and Route 22 interchange area. He noted that the sidewalk would be the responsibility of the property owner but there are portions of sidewalk that will have no property owner. He noted what goes over the Interstate Bridge would be a State right-of-way and there would be no entity to maintain it. He explained that PennDOT's question to the Board, not requiring an answer at this time, is if PennDOT puts in the sidewalk will the Township be willing to enter into a maintenance agreement that we will maintain the sidewalks. He noted that they won't install the sidewalks if there is no agreement. He noted that it is something for the Board to think about as we move to the future. He noted that the Public Works Department is not outfitted to remove snow from a sidewalk area. He suggested that we would need a small loader or Bobcat to be able to do it efficiently and it would take time and workforce and there would be a cost to it.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the second item is the consideration by PennDOT to make Revere Street one-way. He noted in doing so, they would be taking part of the two-way right-of-way and using it for Interstate lane expansion. He noted in making it one-way, they want to reconstruct the alley to the west of Revere Street to provide for loss of circulation from the property owners who would be using one half of the street. He noted that PennDOT questioned if the Township would be willing to accept the alley as part of our public domain and to maintain it. He noted that staff has looked at the alley and in their opinion it is not a good idea unless the alley is properly reconstructed as opposed to just paved. He noted if PennDOT plans only to pave what is there

that would not be acceptable for the Township to take over and maintain as we would need the alley to be widened as there are site distance issues at intersections with Locust Lane that would need to be addressed.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he has a copy of the plan for the Board members to look at but they are way too large for him to display. He explained that he would provide more information in the future as PennDOT provides it to him.

Mr. Hornung questioned when they would be doing the work. Mr. Wolfe responded that it would be two or more years for the interchange work and three years or more for the widening work. Mr. Hornung questioned if they will be doing the work in the evening. Mr. Wolfe answered that he is not sure if that has been decided at this point.

Mrs. Lindsey noted for the sidewalks along Union Deposit Road, if we have to maintain them we could plow them with a Bobcat and two minutes later the plows could come along and plow Union Deposit Road and pile the snow overtop.

Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Wolfe shared the impact on the west side of the highway but he questioned what the impact would be for the east side. Mr. Wolfe answered that they haven't designed that at this point.

Mr. Crissman noted that the last time PennDOT was here, five or six years ago, there was some discussion for another interchange between Colonial Park and Linglestown. He questioned if that is a dead issue. Mr. Wolfe answered that there is no plan for that at this time. He noted that it was a concept that is not part of the current work. Mr. Crissman suggested that residents who live in those areas would be greatly interested as they may be impacted. He noted that the Board needs to be aware of the impact as it will hear it from its constituents.

Mr. Wolfe noted as plans progress and he gets more information, a follow up on a Road Tour would be a good idea. Mr. Crissman noted that it is good that the Board is advised, but we also need to make sure the homeowners know if there would be an impact.

Mr. Seeds questioned if we can see on the plans where the new walks will connect as they will go to nowhere. He suggested that the maintenance could be contracted out. He questioned when PennDOT may start the project. Mr. Wolfe answered that we are two years out for interchange work and three years for expansion of the road.

Mr. Hornung questioned, the areas of the Township where there are walkways owned by the Township; for instance over I-83 or I-18, who takes care of those. Mr. Wolfe answered that

he is not aware of a walkway over I-83 or I-81. Mr. Hornung questioned if Lockwillow Avenue has a sidewalk. Mr. Wolfe answered that they have one but Mountain and Colonial Roads do not. He noted that Lockwillow was put in prior to any requirement that municipalities accept the maintenance and they would be a PennDOT responsibility. He noted that they do not maintain those sidewalks

Mrs. Lindsey questioned what about the sidewalks by Zimmerman Auer Funeral Home over I-83. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be the same situation that goes over Lockwillow Avenue. He noted that they realized that you can't put sidewalks in and not have someone maintain them. He noted that the question is if the Board wants to accept that responsibility.

Mr. Seeds questioned if PennDOT put in sidewalks by Mr. Hornung's store. Mr. Hornung answered that the sidewalks were already there. Mr. Wolfe noted when you have a property owner that abuts the sidewalks, then it becomes the property owner's responsibility either by municipal code or whatever State requirement is out there. He noted that the 2nd Class Township code clearly states that the property owners are responsible for maintaining the sidewalk.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he is trying to reschedule Mr. Bova's presentation for another meeting.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the Board will schedule a time to look at the I-83 project and include it on the Road Tour. He noted at some point we need to let the public know that they can come and see...Mr. Wolfe noted that we are not in that position yet. Mr. Crissman noted when we get to that point; we need to make sure the public is aware of what the impact will be on them. Mr. Seeds noted that PennDOT will have meetings with the citizens. Mr. Wolfe noted that he is sure that the interstate process would require public meetings and we would let PennDOT use this facility if they need to.

Adjournment

Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mrs. Lindsey seconded the motion and the meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Approved by,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

William L. Hornung
Township Secretary