

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Board Meeting held April 14, 2009

A workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6:15 p.m. by Chairman William B. Hawk, on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

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

Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steve Stine, Township Solicitor; William Weaver, Sewer Authority Director; John DiSanto, Catholic Diocese of Harrisburg; Justin Kuhn, K&W Engineers; Carol Potteiger and Molly Reinhart, Happy Trails Dog Park; Brian Luetchford, Parks and Recreation Director; Samuel Robbins, Public Works Director; Watson Fisher and Ted Robertson, SWAN; Ken Parmer; and Bill Bostic.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Public Comment

No public comment was provided.

Presentation by the Dog Park Association of proposed  
rules for the Happy Trails Dog Park

Mr. Luetchford explained that Carol Potteiger and Molly Reinhart of the Dog Park Association are present to address any questions the Board may have. He noted that the Board members were presented a page listing the proposed Happy Trails Dog Park rules. He noted that the rules were submitted to the Parks and Recreation Board by the Dog Park Group, and that Board reviewed and recommended approval of the rules.

Mr. Luetchford explained that the Happy Trails Dog Park construction started yesterday, noting that the fence and fabric would be installed next week, and the area would be enclosed by the end of next week. He surmised that people would start to use the park right away and he would like to have the rules and regulations posted as soon as possible. He noted that the Dog Park Association is requesting permission to post the rules as proposed, and explained that the

rules were taken from dog park organization information found on the Internet and also from the Lower Allen Township Dog Park.

Mr. Crissman noted that the Parks and Recreation Board has reviewed the rules and made a recommendation for approval.

Mr. Seeds noted that he knew of some dog parks requiring the users to sign a release form before they could use the park to protect the Township and the Dog Park Association. He noted that some even charge a nominal fee for membership. He questioned if this was considered by the Dog Park Association. Mr. Luetchford explained that the Township's insurance carrier indicated that it was not necessary. He noted that no one would be present to enforce the membership requirement or to ensure that a waiver form was signed by the users. He explained that Dog Park Association volunteers would be present from time-to-time to oversee the operations. Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Luetchford was concerned about a dog injuring another animal. Ms. Potteiger noted that it is stated in the rules that neither the Dog Park Association nor the Township would be liable for any injuries, and it also stated that aggressive dogs are not permitted to use the park. She noted that there is no means for enforcement, and Mr. Luetchford has informed the Dog Park Association the Township would not be liable for any injuries to dogs. Mr. Seeds questioned if Lower Allen Township has a release form. Mr. Stine noted that the Township has immunity for everything unless there was a defect in the real estate at the park.

Ms. Potteiger answered that Lower Allen Township has a registration form, but she was told that Lower Allen Township cannot enforce it. Mr. Seeds noted that the Dog Park would be open to anyone, and not monitored. Mr. Hawk noted that it would require the Township to staff the operations. Ms. Potteiger noted that the Dog Park Association is hoping to establish a culture of people who would take ownership of the park and police it themselves.

Mr. Hawk questioned how a user would be aware of the rules. Mr. Luetchford answered that the rules would be posted at both gates. Ms. Potteiger noted that the rules would be posted on the website too.

Mr. Luetchford noted that there was some concern about the third rule that states that all dogs must be spayed or neutered. He noted that most dog parks require the owners to keep the dogs out of the park when they are in-heat. He noted that the Township would not allow a certain group of dogs to use the park. Mr. Stine noted that some dogs are breeders, and they would not be spayed or neutered. Ms. Potteiger noted that Lower Allen Township has, as their number one priority, that dogs must be spayed or neutered. She noted that all the volunteers suggested that it should be included in the Dog Park rules. She noted that one of their volunteers is a dog trainer,

and she adamantly suggested that this be included as a rule. She noted that they do not want aggressive dogs using the dog park, and sometimes, dogs become aggressive if they have not been spayed or neutered. She noted that the Township does not want a situation where one dog owner accuses another of impregnating their show dog. She noted if that rule was not in affect, then the dog owners from other areas would be bringing their dogs to the Township park.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Lower Allen Township monitors their dog park. Ms. Potteiger answered that occasionally, a police officer will drive by. Mr. Seeds questioned if a user would have to secure a membership to use the Dog Park. Ms. Potteiger answered that it would be a secretarial nightmare, and there are not funds to have a person monitor the park during the operational hours.

Mr. Blain questioned, back when the dog park was approved, was there funding set aside for maintenance. Mr. Luetchford answered that the intention of the Dog Park Association was to provide the maintenance for the dog park. Ms. Potteiger noted that they would provide the dog bags, but she did not know if arrangements were made for turf or fence repairs. Mr. Blain questioned how this would occur if no membership fee was charged, noting that a membership fee was discussed during the planning stages. Ms. Potteiger answered that the Dog Park Association would continue to have ongoing fund raisers. She noted that there would be an “in memory or in honor of” board also. She noted that people have been very generous to the Dog Park Association.

Mr. Hawk noted that the Dog Park Association has done an outstanding job. Ms. Potteiger explained that over \$12,000 has been collected by means of donations or fundraisers. She noted that a \$1,000 donation was received by a business last week, and the Dog Park Association submitted a grant application to PA DCNR. She noted that the memory board acknowledgement cost \$35.

Ms. Potteiger noted that the Dog Park would be open in less than two weeks, and the leash cutting ceremony will be held Saturday, May 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Mr. Hornung noted that it would be important to list, at the bottom of the rules, that there are ordinances in-place that would provide penalties if the rules are not followed. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would provide that information to Mr. Luetchford.

Request from the Harrisburg Catholic Diocese for reduction in sanitary  
sewer tapping fees and the acquisition of easements

Mr. Weaver noted that the Board members had correspondence from Justin Kuhn, K&W Engineers, who is requesting a reduction in the tapping fees to offset additional costs for the installation of the public sewer extension, for the proposed Bishop McDevitt High School, requested by Staff and CET Engineering. He noted that after speaking with Mr. Wendle of CET Engineering, he found that there had been some changes made to the tapping fee regulations, that would affect Bishop McDevitt High School, and how it could get some of its investment money back. He noted that, typically, a school would not request the Board relief in the tapping fees as it could be offset by reimbursement fees, however, there is no anticipation of development in the area in the next ten years, since Swatara Township's Act 537 Plan does not show sewer for the area. He noted that once someone installs a public sewer, someone could tie into it, but there was discussion if reimbursement should be paid. He noted that Mr. Wendle explained that that has been eliminated with the new tapping fee law, and it states if you tie a house into the sewer then you could receive reimbursement. He noted that there is no anticipation of any development in the near future, and if there was, Bishop McDevitt High School may not get any money back, therefore, since the public sewer was requested by the Township Authority, and it would service the public, the question becomes who is responsible. He noted that the cost is \$13,000.00.

Mr. Hornung questioned if this was a business and not a church building, what would the Township's policy be. Mr. Weaver noted that he would take all this into consideration; since there is no guarantee that the school could get any money back, noting that it is a non-profit institution. Mr. Stine noted that under the Authority's Act, there is no difference. He noted that the Diocese has engineered a way to install a private line without having to do any extra work; however, the Township wants them to install a public system so there is a way to extend it from their property line. He noted that the Authority Act may require someone to do that, but, in return they are entitled to an offset in tapping fees if there are extra costs to it.

Mr. Seeds questioned where the letter requests a reduction in tapping fees. Mr. Weaver answered that it is in the second to last sentence in the third paragraph. Mr. Hornung questioned why the public line was being extended. Mr. Weaver noted that inevitably, a developer would develop any parcels that are available in the future. Mr. Hornung questioned if there was no expectation to extend the line. Mr. Weaver answered that is true in the next ten years. Mr. Hornung questioned if the Township could require a right-of-way, but that it not be extended.

Mr. Stine noted that you can never require a right-of-way, but you could ask for it and acquire it, but then there would be two sewer lines that parallel each other which doesn't make sense.

Mr. Seeds questioned if someone wanted to tap into the public line in the future, would they have to negotiate with the Diocese. Mr. Stine answered yes.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. John DiSanto is present to represent the plan.

Mr. Weaver noted that it is his recommendation to offset the tapping fees at the time they enter into the developer's agreement. He noted that it does not have to be approved at this time as it would be in the form of the developer's agreement. Mr. Hawk questioned if this would have to be done prior to moving along with the land development plan. Mr. Weaver noted that the Board would approve the plan first, and the developer's agreements would come after.

Mr. Hornung questioned what the cost range would be to the School to move the sewer line from the private location to the public location. Mr. Weaver answered that it would cost \$13,000. Mr. Seeds questioned what the tapping fee would be. Mr. Weaver answered that it would be a lot more than that.

Mr. Weaver noted that the Diocese of Harrisburg was asking for some assistance with the easement; however, it appears that Mr. Herbert has been reasonable and since the sewer location would change, it would be further from his house. He noted that Mr. Herbert's sister has not been contacted yet, since there is a new tie in location that runs across her property. Mr. DiSanto noted that there has been contact, and although the issue has not been resolved, he thinks that it would be favorable and a non issue. He noted that Mr. Herbert has been very cooperative.

Mr. Weaver noted that the third issue is that the Authority like to have an agreement that the Diocese would provide an easement for future connection to the public sewer. He noted that the Diocese indicated that they wanted to preserve the right to the property to negotiate with whoever the developer may be that may want to tie into the sewer line in the future. He noted that, typically, the Township requires the developer to provide an easement, but they were not willing to do it. Mr. Stine noted that you cannot take their property without paying for it. Mr. Weaver suggested that it should be part of the developer's agreement, noting that the Diocese would agree to negotiate in good faith with the future developers so the Township does not run into a similar issue where the Township is put in the middle of two property owners who can't agree on an easement. Mr. DiSanto explained that the Diocese would not have a problem with it as he is negotiating for the Diocesan easements, and they do not want to give that right up if there would be a potential payment in the future. Mr. Crissman noted that this is a non-issue as

well. He noted that he wanted to make sure the sewer issues were resolved prior to the Diocese bringing the plan to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. DiSanto brought to his attention that there may be a fourth issue. He noted that the Diocese intends to bring the plan to the Board for preliminary approval on the 21<sup>st</sup> of April. He noted that there is an unresolved issue in regard to a greenway. He noted that the Township recommends that the Diocese should provide a right-of-way for a future greenway.

Mr. DiSanto noted that during a workshop session, the topic of a greenway came up and he was unable to speak to this issue at that time. He noted, since then, the Diocese is willing to provide an easement for a greenway provided there is an idea as to where it is planned. Mr. Luetchford noted that he was not aware of this proposal and could not make a recommendation at this time. Mr. Wolfe noted that this must have been a Planning Commission recommendation. Mr. DiSanto noted that it was a recommendation made by the Board of Supervisors. He suggested that it may be planned in the area, south of Spring Creek Road that is intended to be used for extra athletic fields. He noted that the Diocese would be willing to work with the Township on this issue. Mr. Crissman suggested, if the Parks and Recreation Board develops a greenway in the future, that the location should be determined ahead of time. Mr. Wolfe noted that there was some discussion of planning a greenway along Spring Creek and connecting it to 61 Street, and the Township did not want this parcel to be developed and then block the connection.

Mr. Seeds suggested that it may be included in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Wolfe noted that no one has thought about a location, but the Township wants to insure that it would be available for future planning. Mr. DiSanto noted that the Diocese's preferred location would be on the south side of Spring Creek Road, the side that would not house the building. He noted that the Diocese would be willing to cooperate with the Township. Mr. Luetchford noted that he would review the plan between now and Tuesday night and made a recommendation for a location.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there was anything new on the road closure, noting that there was some opposition from Swatara Township and their fire companies. Mr. DiSanto answered that he spoke to the fire marshal for Swatara Township, and he has a meeting set up next Tuesday with Swatara Township to discuss the issue to have them submit a written proposal that they would not oppose the vacating of Spring Creek Road. He noted that the real issue has been emergency access through Spring Creek Road. He noted that he believes that he has addressed that issue by

installing an emergency emitter on the gates located on Spring Creek Road. He noted that Lower Paxton Township uses the 3M Opticon system, and Swatara Township uses a different provider, but it is the same system. He noted that PERC's can resolve the issue, and he hopes to have that in written form to present to the Board on Tuesday. He noted that their concern was in the event that both Union Deposit Road and Derry Street would be closed, that Spring Creek Road would become an emergency access route. He noted that all the emergency responders would be able to access the emitter system. Mr. Wolfe noted that the sensors would raise the gates for emergency access.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the hard surface road would remain and who would maintain it. Mr. DiSanto answered that the road would remain, and up to the school property, the Township would have to maintain the road. Mr. Seeds noted that the Diocese is planning to open the gates several times a year to exit the football traffic. Mr. DiSanto noted that it would be a minimum of five times to a maximum of eight times a year.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there was any opposition to the neighbors who would not have access to 61<sup>st</sup> Street. Mr. DiSanto noted that no one has spoken for or against the project publicly at the Planning Commission meeting. He noted during the Zoning Hearing Board meeting, a few people were concerned about noise during football games and storm water management. He noted that Hidden Lake has sent a representative to all the meetings, and he was initially concerned, but after listening to the reasoning for closing the roads, he stated that he did not have any objections. He noted that they support it since there would be less traffic in the area.

Mr. DiSanto noted that he put together the pros and cons for closing the road and included that in the packet of information.

Mr. Seeds questioned what issues were to be addressed by the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. DiSanto answered that he asked for relief from the landscape buffer around the property line and the storm water ponds, since they are located in the woods, and he noted that the Zoning Hearing Board approved the variance since the homeowners signed for their support for the request. He noted that the plan was granted a 90% relief, only having to plant some trees along the northern border.

Mr. Crissman questioned if staff supports the Opticon system for the emergency access through the gates. Mr. Wolfe answered that he supports it for emergency vehicles; however, he questioned if it should be opened for football games. He noted that he would not want 1,000 vehicles traveling Spring Creek Road, especially if it is a night game, as they would be traveling a substandard road that they never traveled before. Mr. Hawk questioned what the alternative

would be. Mr. Wolfe answered that all traffic use the 61<sup>st</sup> Street entrance, the same way they entered the complex. Mr. DiSanto noted that Bishop McDevitt High School games are always during the day, and he noted that there had been much discussion if they would continue to only have day games. He noted that he is designing a light plan for the football field, but he did not know if the games would continue to be played during the day. Mr. DiSanto noted that it is not a huge deal breaker as it would only take traffic longer to exit the complex. Mr. Wolfe noted, if the Diocese wanted to use Spring Creek Road, they could contract with the Fire Police to direct traffic at crucial intersections. He noted that this is done at Landis Field for their football games.

Mr. DiSanto questioned Mr. Robbins if he spoke to Perc's about the Opticon system. Mr. Robbins noted that he has not spoke with Perc's in regards to this project. Mr. DiSanto explained that he would provide a letter to the Township from Perc's.

Mr. DiSanto noted that there is a letter from HRG, Inc., concerning the turning lane at Newside Road. He noted that he provided an estimate of \$30,000 to lengthen the turning lane, and HRG, Inc. submitted an estimate for \$160,000, as they think the intersection should be overlaid out to Union Deposit Road. He noted that he received an independent estimate for \$80,000, and suggested that HRG, Inc.'s comment was excessive. Mr. Wolfe suggested that Mr. DiSanto should get the information to Mr. Robbins. Mr. Wolfe questioned what PENNDOT requires. Mr. Kuhn noted that PENNDOT has not required the School to provide PENNDOT with a traffic study for that intersection, therefore, he looked at that intersection at the request of the Township. He noted that PENNDOT has no requirement for that intersection at Newside and Union Deposit Roads. Mr. Robbins noted that they may not require a study, but when the school goes to get the HOP, they may require improvements. He questioned if they have had conversations with PENNDOT. Mr. Kuhn answered that he has met with PENNDOT three times, and they only required a traffic assessment for Page Road and Spring Creek Road where the new traffic signal would be installed, and it was delivered to them last week. He noted that PENNDOT has not asked them to look at other intersections. Mr. DiSanto noted that he is confident that PENNDOT is limiting their review to the intersection of Page Road and Spring Creek Road, with the lowering of the hump in the road and the installation of turning lanes. He noted that it is a significant contribution for the plan. Mr. Crissman questioned if this discussion would hold up the approval for next Tuesday's meeting. Mr. Wolfe noted that he did not know, but it could be reviewed at staff level to be resolved or determined to be a problem. Mr. Crissman requested Mr. DiSanto to withdraw the plan from the agenda until the issues are

resolved. Mr. Wolfe suggested that staff should review the plan to see if there are any outstanding issues.

Mr. Crissman noted that he would like Mr. DiSanto to bring a clean plan to the Board meeting.

Continued discussion regarding fees for the use of the compost facility  
and/or the sale of compost material

Mr. Robbins explained that it costs the Township more than \$200,000 in labor and fuel to run the compost facility, not including the costs for the equipment. He noted between \$450,000 to \$500,000 worth of equipment is dedicated to run the compost facility.

Mr. Robbins explained when the Township makes applications to the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) for 902 Grant funds, one of the concerns that they push is the issue of sustainability to receive the maximum amount of grant funding. He noted that Mr. Miller spoke to the Department of Agriculture (DOA) and was told that there are no issues with selling the compost as long as the Township does not provide any information that the compost has any value other than being a screened leaf compost. He noted that the DOA has no concern for tracking the materials.

Mr. Robbins noted that it is difficult to determine how many commercial contractors would use the facility. He noted that 15 to 20 contractors use the facility each year, some more than others. He noted that the yard and landscape contractors are the ones who use the facility, and they are in compliance with what they bring to the compost facility. He noted that some contractors deposit shrubs that they removed from yards, and the tub grinder is able to grind the material. He noted, if the Township charged \$400 per contractor, the Township could expect revenues of \$4,000 to \$5,000 a year. He noted that many residents use the facility, and some use the facility on numerous occasions on the same day. He noted that contractors would want the Township to accept material larger in diameter, but it would have to be careful that it doesn't receive too much material, and then fall behind in composting.

Mr. Robbins suggested that a fair rate to charge the residents would be \$15 to \$20 a year. He noted that the facility has been open for six working days, and it is not getting the typical amount of volume that it received in the past. He noted that more people are leaving their yard waste at the curb side to have Waste Management pick up. He suggested that people would not have a hard time paying between \$15 and \$20 to use the facility during the season. He suggested that it could amount to another \$25,000 in revenues. He noted that the facility would never pay for itself. Mr. Crissman agreed that more people would use Waste Management's services if the

Township started to charge a fee. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would reduce vehicle trips to the facility which would be good.

Mr. Ken Parmer, 4292 South Carolina Drive, explained that he lives at the end of Colonial Road, and he makes sure that the cable is up preventing people from dumping. He noted that he has lived in the Township since 1968, and years ago, people were dumping all over the Township. He noted that since Waste Management picks up yard waste and bulk items, this has decreased. He noted that a good place to check for illegal dumping would be George Park, at the top of the mountain. He noted that on one occasion, he reported a person who was illegally dumping at the end of Colonial Road, and it was found to be a local landscaper. He noted that \$10 to \$15 per year is not a very expensive fee to charge. Mr. Wolfe noted that no one in Lower Paxton Township has to drive their trash, recyclables, solid waste or leaf waste items anywhere as the Township provides curbside collection for all of those items at a very reasonable cost, to include bulk items. He noted that illegal dumping does occur, and in many instances, it is found that they are items that are dumped from non-residents.

Mr. Robbins noted that the residents complain that they want the facility open more, but the residents need to understand that a person would have to be paid to provide this service. He noted, if staff does not man the operations, then people dump illegal items at the facility.

Mr. Robbins noted that another source of revenue would be to wholesale a portion of the screened compost. He noted, if residents have to pay to dump their yard waste, then they will want the screen compost as part of the fee. He noted that there should be some restrictions on the amount of compost a person would be allowed to take. He explained that staff puts out, between 12 to 15 yards of compost material every two days, and it is gone. He suggested that a portion of the yard waste should be sold wholesale, and restrict what the residents are permitted to take. He noted that some residents come in to pick up the yard waste, but never bring any in to be processed.

Mr. Luetchford explained that he does spread some of the yard waste on the playing fields in the Township parks.

Mr. Robbins noted that some of the material could be sold to a company similar to Zeigler Brothers. He noted that when there is too much woody waste, they call Zeigler Brothers and they use their equipment to haul it away. He noted that this could be done on the days that the facility is open. He explained that the compost facility received roughly \$2,000 and \$3,000 in income last year. He noted if the Township had to store this material on site it would be a bigger issue for the Public Works Department.

Mr. Robbins noted that a non-resident fee could also be implemented for contractors and non-residents. He suggested that he could have a fee-based program ready for the first Tuesday in June, noting that a sticker affixed to a vehicle would be an easy means to start the program. He explained that he would eventually like to have a card reader gate with a camera system, allowing staff to do other work. He noted that a gate system would cost between \$30,000 to \$35,000 to set up, and he would be able to view Saturday's video to check for illegal dumping. He noted that he would have all the vehicles' license plates recorded when the sticker is issued.

Mr. Hawk noted that some Township's provide these types of services and he suggested that he may be able to provide Mr. Robbins with information through PSATS. Mr. Robbins noted that Londonderry Township charges a fee and they use a card reader system, and North Lebanon Township also has a similar system.

Mr. Wolfe questioned if the Board members are interested in establishing fees for service for a commercial hauler, residential drop off and pick up, and ultimately for the wholesale of material. He questioned, if the Board members would be interested in implementing a June 1, 2009 start date. Mr. Seeds noted that the Board previously discussed this item. Mr. Wolfe noted, at that time, he was to come back to the Board with more information. Mr. Seeds thought that the Board agreed to charge the commercial haulers. Mr. Robbins noted that he did not think the potential for revenue would be what it was originally thought to be for commercial haulers. He noted that the Township's facility is a good size, and it receives a lot of material, and he wanted to explain the options to the Board members.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the Township should charge individuals who drop off materials, or only those who pick up materials. Mr. Wolfe noted that selling material on site would be much easier with the use of a fixed permit sticker for entry in and out. He noted, if a person pays \$20, they would be permitted to use the facility anytime that it is open for the dropping off of material and the taking away of material, if available. He noted that it would be much easier than having to pay \$5 to pick up one load of compost. He noted that there is no means on site to collect money or invoice a person. He noted, if the Township were to permit commercial haulers at a cost of \$400 per year, it could be for a small landscaper or for an Asplundh-type contractor, who clears branches from power lines. He noted that the Township needs to implement a simple program without a huge administrative cost. Mr. Seeds questioned if there could be different classes for commercial haulers. Mr. Robbins noted that the Township could not charge by weight since it does not have a scale, and he explained that he was trying to get away from having to staff the operation.

Mr. Hornung questioned if a card reader could be used in such a way that it could limit the number of trips a person could make. Mr. Robbins answered that a card reader could be set up in that manner. Mr. Hornung noted that it could limit the amount of trips a contactor could make to the facility. Mr. Wolfe noted that the program could be fine tuned in the future with the use of a card reader system. Mr. Hornung noted that he would be in favor of it as long as there is no money exchanged at the site.

Mr. Wolfe questioned if a fee should be assessed to the residents. Mr. Hornung noted that there should be a fee for people from outside the Township since the residents are bearing a certain cost for running the facility. Mr. Robbins noted that there are not too many outside residents who use the facility. He noted that staff has checked driver's licenses, and they don't find many outside residents attempting to use the facility. Mr. Wolfe noted that there could be a non-resident tipping fee implemented to generate revenue. Mr. Stine noted that the facility gets Act 101 grants from the Commonwealth and he did not know if non-residents could be treated differently since, theoretically, they did contribute to the facility. Mr. Hornung noted that the Township may be in violation by not allowing outside residents to use the facility. Mr. Robbins noted that DEP is very favorable if the Township allows other municipalities the use of the facility.

Mr. Seeds questioned, if the Township charged \$20 per year for a resident, then they could have an unlimited amount of material to use. Mr. Seeds noted that the stickers could be sold at the Municipal Center for a one-time use as well. Mr. Wolfe noted that citizens could purchase a fixed sticker or a one-use ticket. Mr. Seeds noted that it would be the only way someone could pick up compost material for their own use. Mr. Robbins noted that staff would have to stop the person who comes in with a trailer and shovels five yards of material on this trailer. He noted that people don't need a lot of it, and he is not sure what they are doing with it. Mr. Robbins noted, by the second week of July he would be out of material. Mr. Seeds noted that he would want to dump his waste material whenever he needs to. Mr. Crissman questioned what would happen if a residents pays \$5 to pick up compost and there is non available. Mr. Robbins suggested that it would not be an issue if there is a restriction for the amount of material a person could take. He noted that it could be restricted to a specific container or bag size. Mr. Seeds noted that the contractors often take a lot of compost. Mr. Robbins noted that named landscapers do not come in to take large amounts.

Mr. Hawk noted that the Board members are in favor of accessing a fee and Mr. Robbins could work out the details. Mr. Seeds noted, if the Township expands its hours, it would cost

more in labor. Mr. Robbins noted that the biggest complaint received regarding the compost facility is that it is not open enough. He noted that he did not have a good handle on what type of revenue the Township could make on the compost facility. Mr. Seeds questioned if there are contractors that frequent the facility. Mr. Robbins answered yes. He noted that this time of the year, a lot of material comes in.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the contractors try to dump grass. Mr. Robbins noted that they are not allowed to do this. Mr. Parmer noted that he questioned a landscaper who was dumping grass clippings in a no dumping area, and he was told that it was not dumping as the material was organic. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be a case of illegal dumping.

Mr. Robbins noted that he would put something together for the Board member to review.

Review of the proposed loan and line of credit offered to  
Koons Memorial Park Swim Club by Centric Bank

Mr. Wolfe noted that he has worked with Mr. Luetchford and members of the Koons Memorial Park Swim Club and Centric Bank to develop a loan agreement for operating capital and a second loan for a line of credit. He noted that the Bank is offering a loan in the amount of \$11,000 to cover existing debt, and an \$8,000 line of credit, for a total loan of \$19,000. He noted that the Township needs to be a Guarantor to both agreements for this to take place, and if the Board agrees with this, he would place this item on the agenda for approval at the April 21, 2009 meeting.

Mr. Seeds questioned if this was a done deal. Mr. Wolfe answered that it is not completed until the Board signs the agreement. Mr. Luetchford noted that the Board members are looking at the Letters of Intent, not the loan documents. Mr. Seeds questioned the expiration date of March 12, 2009. Mr. Blain noted that Centric Bank would keep the offer open for Board approval.

Mr. Crissman questioned how much of the \$8,000 credit line the Swim Club would use for the drain repair. Mr. Wolfe answered that none of the expenditures were identified to be used for the drain issue. He noted that the \$8,000 line of credit is for their operating costs over the course of the summer. Mr. Crissman noted that there are no funds identified for the drain issue. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township does not know what the drain issue could cost. Mr. Luetchford noted that the Swim Club does not know what the costs would be. Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Luetchford had an estimate of what the costs would be. Mr. Luetchford answered that he could not hazard a guess, but the Koons Swim Club believes they have a line on what they need to do for the drain covers. He noted that the only pool that would require a

second drain would be the kiddie pool. He noted that he has not looked at the pools, and he is not sure that their information is accurate. Mr. Seeds noted that they may have the same problems that are occurring at the Friendship Center. Mr. Luetchford noted that he did not know if they have water flow issues as well.

Mr. Seeds stated that he did not like the terms of the agreement and requirements that they are putting on the Swim Club and the Township. Mr. Blain questioned what Mr. Seeds did not like. Mr. Seeds noted that the banks have a lot of requirements as far as budgets and accountability and internal financial statements. Mr. Blain noted that every bank requires that type of information, especially since the bank is providing a loan with no collateral. Mr. Seeds noted that the bank knows that Lower Paxton Township would guarantee the loan. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township is responsible, but the cost to collect a delinquent loan in the amount of \$11,000 could be more than the outstanding principal balance of the loan. He noted that the bank is offering the loan in good faith, and the Township would be offering to sign the loan in good faith, not knowing the organization's ability to function.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there has been internal strife within the Swim Club. Mr. Luetchford noted that Mr. Barto, who personally appeared before the Board members, was removed from the Board, noting that Walter Shatto and Doug Kepler are the principal operators for the pool. Mr. Crissman noted that they are the individuals signing the document, and he assumed that the organization has been reorganized, and are providing solid leadership. Mr. Wolfe noted that he could not attest to that statement. He noted that the Township received a \$1,000 donation from a foundation for Koons Memorial Pool. He noted that the check was only permitted to be given to a not-for-profit organization or governmental entity, and the association never incorporated as a not-for-profit organization.

Mr. Bostic noted that the organization is much more on top of things this year. He noted that signage is up around the community seeking members. He explained that they started to clean one of the pools, and a church donated \$500 to help support the pool. He noted that there are clear signs that whoever is running the organization is doing things differently this year. He noted that, last year, at this time, there was no activity.

Mr. Seeds noted that there are the unanswered questions regarding the drain issues. He questioned if the interest rate seemed to be high. Mr. Wolfe noted that the interest rate is 6.75% and suggested that it is not very high. Mr. Stine noted that it is an unsecured loan. Mr. Seeds noted that he wants to help them out, and he questioned if the pool would open with the drain issues. Mr. Luetchford noted that he would not know that unless this process moves forward.

Mr. Blain noted that the Board members informed the Koons Memorial Swim Club that the Township would move forward with the opportunity if they were willing to find a bank that would allow the Township to act as a second guarantor. Mr. Blain noted that he is okay with the terms of the loan. Mr. Crissman noted that they would not get a better deal somewhere else. Mr. Seeds noted that they would if the Township loaned them the money. Mr. Blain noted that it would go against the philosophy of what the Board was trying to do, to get them off of a government subsidy. He noted, if the Township gave the Swim Club the money, there would be no incentive for them to run it properly. Mr. Seeds suggested that the Township could lend them the money. Mr. Hawk noted that by July, it would be known if the Swim Club would survive. Mr. Blain noted that the Township is not a bank, not federally insured, and the Township has loaned money to the fire companies, which is a public service provider for public safety. He suggested, if you loan the money to the Koons Pool, then who else would approach the Township for a loan. Mr. Stine noted that with the fire companies, the Township has a mortgage and security in the real estate. Mr. Seeds noted if the pool does not open, they would have no means to pay back the loan, so the bottom line is, that the Township would have to pay the loan. Mr. Blain noted that this provides for private funding to give them an opportunity to make a go of it. He noted, if the Township gets stuck with paying off the loan, then the Township would have no future obligation to uphold the Swim Club.

Mr. Hawk noted that it puts the onerous on the Swim Club to move forward with various activities to generate the money to keep it running. Mr. Wolfe noted that there is a significant concern as to whether the loan is collectable. He noted that doing it in this format, the Township does not have to be the collection agency or the bad guy.

Mr. Blain questioned what the Township has spent on this pool annually. Mr. Wolfe answered that it has been \$7,000 in the past; however, there were additional costs since the Township paid for the new pump. Mr. Blain noted that by having the Swim Club maintain the loan, the Township could shut the pool down if they renege on their loan.

Mr. Seeds stated that he did not mean that he does not want to provide the loan, but he was concerned about the terms. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township brokered the deal for the Swim Club, but they could go to any bank to establish a relationship. Mr. Blain noted that Jeff Myers stated that he always wanted to do something for the Township and this was the opportunity. Mr. Seeds noted that there is no risk on the part of the bank. Mr. Wolfe noted, if the loan is in default, then the Bank could spend legal funds to act on the default. Mr. Blain noted that the Swim Club would have operating funds coming in the door for membership, and other

contributions as well. He noted, if the loan is in default, it would be due to their inability to pay down the loan. He noted that the Township has provided the Swim Club more than \$7,000 a year. Mr. Crissman suggested that the Board should move ahead and cosign the loan.

Status report on the Greenway Committee's efforts to  
acquire property to preserve the Darlington Trail

Mr. Luetchford noted that the Greenway Committee has identified the first greenway project for the Township. He explained that the Committee has worked with the Parks and Recreation Board, as well as the landowner, to develop a greenway, west of Hocker Park and east of the Boyd Big Tree Conservation area. He noted that the plan calls for a simple trail that would involve three private property owners. He noted that Blue Mountain Parkway is located to the east of the plan, and the loops found on the map at the top of the mountain constitute Hocker Park. He noted that the park boundaries for Hocker Park have been defined and found to be somewhat different than what was originally thought.

Mr. Luetchford explained that Tim Spangler is the landowner adjacent to the park. He noted that the Township installed a gate that has curtailed much of the illegal dumping that has occurred in the past. Mr. Luetchford noted that the Darlington Trail follows a path through various properties whereas the crest of the mountain follows a straight line, noting that the entire path is located on the Township's side of the mountain.

Mr. Luetchford explained that the landowners involved are Tim Spangler and Jim Spangler who sold the Wolfersberger Tract to the Township. He noted that the path continues onto the Schreckengaust property. He noted that the Schreckengaust property was purchased by the Central Pennsylvania Conservancy and is now dedicated to the State. He noted that the path continues through a timber strip owned by Richard Yingst. He explained that he has had preliminary conversations with the property owners, and it is the intent of the Greenway Committee to be provided easements from the property owners for the continuation of the Darlington Trail. He noted that the trail would join with the Boyd Big Tree Conservation area after it passes through the Yingst timber trail. He noted that since this only involved three property owners, it was chosen as the first project for the Greenway Committee.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the Greenway Committee intends to continue discussions with the three property owners, to identify what the value of the property would be with or without the easement, and to describe how the property owners could benefit by providing the easement or

selling it to the Township. He explained that there would be an IRS benefit to the property owners who chose to donate the land to the Township.

Mr. Hornung noted that all those properties are landlocked and it is a big issue for them. He noted that the land is worth very little, but if the land was opened up somehow, the land would triple in price. He suggested if in the development of the trail, the land become unlandlocked, it would work to their benefit. Mr. Luetchford noted that the Township could provide an easement on its property to the land owners if they provide an easement to the Township. Mr. Hornung noted that you would have to design a good site distance for anyone coming out of Hocker Park.

Mr. Hawk noted if the property owners provide an easement to the Township and have their properties reevaluated, they can claim that loss of value on their income tax. Mr. Luetchford noted that the burden is to prove that to the property owners. He noted that this is a learning process for the staff and the Greenway Committee to understand the easement process.

Mr. Hornung noted that by providing an easement for the land, it would decrease the value of the land, as no one would want to live next to an easement. He noted that the Greenway Committee requested Mr. George and Mr. MacIntyre to engage in preliminary discussions with the property owners.

Mr. Hornung suggested, if the property owners were allowed to move the location of the trail to suit their needs, it may make it more accommodating for them. Mr. Luetchford noted, if the trail was lowered a little on the map, there would be less impact for some of the property owners. He noted another possibility would be to move the trail north of the properties and possibly construct it in Middle Paxton Township. He noted that the top area of Blue Mountain contains the Susquehanna Appalachian Trail Club, and their membership stated that they would have no problem moving a trail north or south. He noted that they have committed to maintaining the Darlington Trail, if the Greenway Committee procures the rights for it.

Mr. Crissman questioned who owned the land on the Middle Paxton Township side of the mountain. Mr. Luetchford answered that he has not identified that yet. Mr. Hornung explained that the north side of the mountain is unusable as it is very steep and all rock. He suggested taking a very good look at the landscape in that area.

Review of the proposed Parks and Recreation Plan as a  
component part of the Comprehensive Plan  
and  
Use of the Plan in maintaining the fee-in-lieu of recreation  
dedication as proposed in the new SALDO

Mr. Luetchford noted that the Parks and Recreation Board have developed a Parks and Recreation Plan in response to the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC), and the statements in the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance; (SALDO), for the need for a plan as part of the Comprehensive Plan. He noted, item D, is the Mandatory Recreation Dedication Ordinance which would, “maintain compliance with the conclusions and recommendations in the Township’s Recreation Plan and consistency with the Township’s Comprehensive Plan regarding recreation.” He noted that the MPC requires a recreation plan in order to allow the ordinance to charge a fee in lieu or request land. He noted that the current plan does not have this information contained in it. He noted that the purpose of this ordinance is to require land, noting that a development must have land to take care of the population moving into the development. He noted that this would be the recommendation for all future developments from the Parks and Recreation Board that they would like to require land and not provide the option for fee-in-lieu.

Mr. Luetchford noted that five years ago, he completed a survey of five municipalities, Hampton, Derry, Susquehanna, Swatara and Springettsbury Townships, all urban Townships that have a similar structure to the Township. He noted that he found a variety of needs, but he found that although the Township has twice the population of these Townships, it does not have twice the amount of land. He noted that currently, the Township has a little over 200 acres of usable parkland. He noted that Hampton and Derry Townships have roughly the same amount of land with half the population. He noted that the National Parks and Recreation Association requires between seven to twenty acres per 1,000 people, and the Township is no where near that amount of land. He suggested that the Township would need roughly 200 more acres of land to meet that standard. He noted that the Township should have between 500 and 900 acres to meet that need, and with an expected population of 54,000 in the year 2020, there would be a need for additional parkland.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the Parks and Recreation Board suggests that their goal should be that a certain amount of acreage, .0423 acre, would be due per unit. He noted that that figure would provide for 162 additional acres in the future. He noted that if the SALDO is to require acreage, there must be a reason for coming up with the suggested figures. He noted that that figure would provide for little less than 500 acres of parkland in the Township at buildout.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the Parks and Recreation Board is looking for approval of this document for the SALDO. Mr. Wolfe noted that he plans to bring the SALDO and the Parks Plan for review in a workshop session in the near future.

Mr. Seeds noted that this was discussed in the fall of 2007 with the Planning Commission. He noted that for a plan with 50 lots or less, there was a discussion that in place of a fee-in-lieu, that where the land would be adjacent to other parkland, there would be a requirement for land. He suggested that it should be added under Section C. He noted that the decision should be left up to the Township, and not the developer. He noted that there is a requirement for 150-foot frontage, and he suggested that the land may not be able to meet that requirement, but it may have access to other parks or school land. Mr. Luetchford noted that a recommendation from the Parks and Recreation Board would be taken into consideration, and he stated that he would ensure that there is flexibility in making recommendations for land.

Mr. Luetchford noted that he also included a memorandum for the Park Planning Process and this document is associated with the Park Plan. He noted that the Parks and Recreation Board discussed the planning of future parks. He noted that there is no defined procedure for the development of parks. He noted in the recent past, George Park was designed by means of a public planning process where the Parks and Recreation Board met with the public, sports groups, and neighbors to make suggestions of what they would like to see in the park. He noted the Parks and Recreation Board used this information to make recommendations to the Board.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the Parks and Recreation Board has designed a park planning process, in outline form, to identify park property attributes, identify possible park users and uses, and a schedule for public meetings. He noted that all the information received would be compiled, at which time the Parks and Recreation Board would make a recommendation to the Board, and if approved, retain professional services to design the park. He noted that one final public meeting would be held before receiving the plan approval from the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Luetchford explained that the Parks and Recreation Board is requesting approval of this plan for use for all future park planning. Mr. Wolfe explained that the Board should determine if it wants to start this process for the Wolfersberger Tract. He noted that the Board did offer part of the Wolfersberger Tract to CASA. Mr. Blain suggested that the offer made to CASA is no longer viable, as Mr. Weidner is no longer the president of CASA, and the remaining members' focus seems to be to upgrade the fields that they use in the Township. Mr. Crissman noted, if this is true, then the Parks and Recreation Board could move forward with the park planning process for the Wolfersberger Tract.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the park planning process was shared with any developers. Mr. Luetchford answered no. Mr. Hornung suggested that it should be shared with Ms. Molinari before it would be adopted. Mr. Crissman agreed that she would be a good person to review the plan. Mr. Hornung noted that a developer may find loopholes in the process that the Parks and Recreation Board does not see.

Mr. Hornung noted, in the calculations for the SALDO, it was listed at .423 for the calculation and it should be .0423 in Section D.

Mr. Seeds noted that the current plan lists 1,500 square foot and 20% of land area for land zoned R-2. Mr. Luetchford noted that he has never enacted this requirement since he has worked for the Township. Mr. Hornung noted that, in going through the budgeting process, many items were listed as dire needs, and without taking these into account, in the near future, the Board will be forced to raise taxes. He noted that some of the needs are expensive items, noting that the development of parkland is a hidden expense that is eating up the reserves, as well as the hiring of additional police officers. He noted, if the Township acquires much parkland, it would be stupid to just let it sit idle. He noted, if the Township does not have the funding to develop the parks, it does not make sense to acquire the land. He noted that there is no money to develop the Wolfersberger Tract, so through the planning process, there is a need to look at how the parks would be developed under the current budget restraints. He questioned what is more important, more money or more land. He suggested that there should be a balance for the Township that as it acquires land, it must come up with the money to develop it.

Mr. Hawk noted, if the Township owns the land, it owns the asset. Mr. Hornung suggested that the asset doesn't do the Township much good if it doesn't have the funding to develop it. He noted that every time an acre of parkland is developed, there is an ongoing expense to maintain it. He noted that there are many programs that need to be completed for transportation issues. Mr. Blain noted that having the land is great, but it is a non-working asset, and not cash flow that could be used towards the repair of storm sewer, and road maintenance issues. He noted, if a bond was issued, then there would be debt service costs to pay. He noted that there would be time and cash flow to maintain the property.

Mr. Crissman noted, if the opportunity exists to purchase the land, and the Township does not take it, then it would be limiting itself for future generations when the land doesn't exist for recreational purposes. He suggested that the Township should avail itself of the opportunity to purchase the land, and then it would have it when the time comes to develop it. Mr. Blain questioned what is the balancing line, especially since the Township owns 93 acres of land that is

not developed. Mr. Blain questioned how long the Township has been paying on the land. Mr. Wolfe answered that it has been eight years, and there is no conceivable plan to develop it, as it was truly a land-banked purchase. Mr. Blain noted that the Township has land-banked almost 100 acres of property.

Mr. Hornung noted, if the Township wants to continue to land-bank, then it must also raise taxes to compensate for it. Mr. Crissman noted that he is not saying that the Township should be purchasing more land, but he noted that when the deal was presented to the Township, it was a deal that the Township could not pass up. He stated that he did not agree that money should be included in the budget to go out and purchase additional land. Mr. Hornung noted that the chances of the Township seeing another opportunity for the purchase of a Wolfersberger Tract are slim to none. He noted that the Township could not afford to compete with developers to purchase additional vacant land. He noted that the only process for the Township to acquire additional parkland is through the SALDO requirements. He suggested that the Parks and Recreation Board should develop a plan, noting the budgetary constraints and determine how it wants to move forward. Mr. Crissman noted that the land should not be sold. Mr. Hornung agreed. Mr. Crissman noted that he did not think that the Township should be actively pursuing the purchase of additional parkland.

Mr. Seeds noted that Hampton Township received some of their land from the Naval Depot.

Submission of DCNR grant application for park planning and beginning a public planning process for the Wolfersberger Tract

Mr. Luetchford noted that the Parks and Recreation Board would be seeking approval to move ahead with the park planning process for the Wolfersberger Tract. He noted that the Township could apply, by April 22, 2009, for a planning grant to provide a 50/50 matching grant to have professional park plans completed, next year, as the park would be paid in full in January 2011. Mr. Wolfe questioned the Board if it would be okay to apply for the grant. Mr. Seeds stated that he would agree to a 50/50 plan.

Mr. Luetchford noted that Koons Park is in close proximity to the Wolfersberger Tract, and the thinking is that both parks should be reviewed as sister parks. Mr. Hornung questioned if there would be an interest in someone swapping acreage for the Wolfersberger Tract for another location where a park is needed. Mr. Luetchford answered that he did not know. Mr. Hornung noted that the southern section of the Township is lacking parkland.

### Status report on George Park construction activities and dedication ceremony

Mr. Luetchford noted that the park entrance construction project for the Thomas B. George Jr. Park is 50% completed, noting that Handwerk has been working on Nyes Road, and staff is working to secure the easement for the Gardner property. He stated that he hopes to have a resolution to the easement issue within the next week or two. He noted that once that is accomplished, then the Township could resubmit for the joint permit with DEP. He noted that he is trying to move as fast as possible to acquire the joint permit.

Mr. Luetchford explained that he has projected to spend between \$250,000 and \$300,000 in 2009, to finish the project.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the Parks and Recreation Board has set a tentative date of June 2, 2009, 5:30 p.m., for the dedication ceremony for the Park. Mr. Wolfe questioned if the Board members' calendars could accommodate that date. The Board members responded affirmatively.

### Submission of DCNR grant application for the skate park

Mr. Luetchford explained that in 2008, the Township applied for a \$250,000 grant, and he noted that it was a close miss for the grant. He noted that the Township's match for the grant would be \$250,000. He explained that he was told by DCNR staff that the application would stand a greater chance if there was more Intermunicipal cooperation. He noted that he spoke with the Director of Dauphin County Parks and Recreation, who indicated that they would be interested in doing cooperative programming with the Township, and would be willing to write a letter in support of the project. He noted that Dauphin County provided \$5,000 to the Township to start the project. He explained, since there is a commitment for cooperative programming with Dauphin County, he believes that it would greatly help to receive approval for the grant this year. He noted that he is seeking Board approval to submit a grant to DCNR for the year 2009.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the project costs are still estimated at \$500,000. Mr. Luetchford noted that it could be higher, depending on the cost of concrete. Mr. Seeds questioned where the remaining \$250,000 would come from. Mr. Luetchford answered that it would be the responsibility of The Freedom Group to raise the money. Mr. Seeds suggested that the Township may be able to help with additional funding if the project is awarded the grant.

Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Hornung on the status of fundraising for the skate park. Mr. Hornung answered that he put the project on hold when the economy took a downturn. He noted that he recently reinstated the project and has started to actively solicit funds for the skate park.

He explained that he is getting a more positive response from the people he has called, and he is using the services of Brian Yesilonis to assist with the fundraising.

Mr. Luetchford noted that he budgeted for the development of the construction plans for the skate park, and he has been working on that for the last ten months. He noted that the plan was developed by a group called, Team Pain, through a public planning process. He noted that the park would include a beginning, intermediate and advance levels, and that it would be 180 feet long and 80 feet wide.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the plan includes inlets at the low spots around the skate park to provide for water drainage issues. He noted that the water is drained into the wetlands south of the park behind Possibility Place. He noted that the design calls for lighting that may be installed at a later date. He noted that two basketball courts, a volleyball court, and tennis court would also use the lighting as well. He noted that there is enough power into the park to light all those facilities.

Mr. Luetchford noted the Township has spent roughly \$35,000 to \$40,000 to develop the design, and there is the potential to put the plans to bid when the project is ready to proceed.

#### The Virginia Graham-Baker Act and its impact upon the Friendship Center pools

Mr. Luetchford explained that the intent of the Virginia Graham-Baker Act is to provide safety in pools. He explained that former Secretary of State, James Baker's granddaughter, died in a pool accident, and Congress passed legislation in December 2007 that required pool compliance by December 2008. He noted that it was impossible for most pools owners throughout the nation to make the deadline since the manufacturers were unable to manufacture proper pool covers within that time period. He noted that the law also contained ambiguous language; therefore, it is uncertain exactly what is required. He noted that the Friendship pools are out of compliance, and he suggested that many pools may not open this summer if they are not in compliance.

Mr. Luetchford explained that he is motivated to comply as soon as he can identify what could be installed in the pools for a reasonable price. Mr. Wolfe noted that this is an unbudgeted expenditure. Mr. Crissman noted that the governmental agencies are having difficulty in deciding what the law states and requires.

Mr. Luetchford noted that there are two issues that fall under this Act. He explained that a pool with an old-style drain, one that is 8 inches in diameter or less could be sealed off by a

person with their body, and the pump could eviscerate the child, or their hair could get caught in the drain and they could drown.

Mr. Luetchford explained that an analysis was conducted of the pools at the Friendship Center (FC) by Aquatic Facility Design, and they suggested that new drain covers should be installed. He noted that the manufacturer of drain covers are using this as a money making proposition. He noted that Aquatic Facility Design installed the pool and knows all the specifications for the pool; therefore they should be able to make a fiberglass plastic drain cover, at a minimal price, that could be installed by screwing out the existing cover and installing a new cover. He noted that the manufacturers are making stainless steel covers that don't fit, charging \$1,000 per drain, noting that the stainless steel must be grounded, and this would be difficult to do since the pool shell is in place. He noted that he has made contact, through the Internet, with a company that could provide a drain cover, and it is sold by two local companies. He suggested that the screw holes and thread count might match, and if they do, this would be a low-cost option. He noted that he would work with a local company to see if they could be bought and installed by staff. He noted that it would be difficult to do with the water in the pool, and he suggested that the pool would have to be drained, in order to screw out the old drain and install the new drain covers. He noted that there are two windows of time when this could be done, the first week of June or during the maintenance shutdown in August. He noted that it is unknown if the government would put pressure on the Township to come into compliance sooner. He noted that the pools do not have a single drain, as they were updated to modern standards. He noted that the pump is pumping into two drains, and that both drains would have to be sealed off to create a hazardous situation. He noted that the drains are 18" by 18" in size. He noted that the chances of having a liability suit filed against the Township are very slim.

Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Luetchford has been working with a government inspector to indicate what the Township's intentions are. Mr. Luetchford answered that he has had no contact with any government inspectors. Mr. Crissman suggested that the Township should wait until August when the pools are drained for the yearly maintenance.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the other issue is the flow rate. He noted that the flows in the three pools are adequate and would not create a vortex affect. He noted that the problem is that there are two pumps working off three drains in the leisure pool that service the water slide and the water spray features. He noted that there is such a flow going through those pumps, that you couldn't form a vortex with the size of the plate in the pool. He noted that Aquatic Facility Design suggested changing the pumps to install a pump release system, install a water flow

restrictor, or change the impeller of the motors, all of which are expensive items. He noted that the pool never operates full-open with the pumps, noting that the water flows were checked with a meter, and it was found that it is less than the maximum flow of 1,350 gallons per minutes, as the Township is at 1,325 gallons per minute on a regular basis. He suggested that it might be good to install a permanently welded stop, but the consultant would not agree that it would solve the problem. He noted that it has to be a permanently set system that could not be changed or moved.

Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Luetchford had a quote of \$4,425 to fix the pool to install the covers and a weld. Mr. Wolfe noted, if the Township could get away with installing just the new drain covers, it would save a lot of money. Mr. Luetchford noted that the price does not include draining and refilling the pools. He noted that this would only work if everything fits, and if it doesn't fit, then they would have to jackhammer the pool to put in new sumps and covers. He noted that there are many possibilities for repairs, and it would depend on how the pool covers would fit. He noted that that is the reason for the large range of costs, noting that it could cost between \$9,000 and \$71,000, if all the pools had to be torn up. He noted that he would not know until he tried to put the covers in place.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the propellers were changed or the vortex was changed, which would lower the gallons per minute to satisfy the suction problem, and would it cause a problem with the water flow for the water slide. Mr. Luetchford answered, not with the current setup. He noted that the pool's pumps have not been fully opened; noting that if they were set to capacity the water would hit the ceiling.

Mr. Hornung question if the pumps are used as variable speed pumps which restricts the use and could use more energy than needed. Mr. Luetchford noted that he is talking about the filtration system versus the water features. He noted if the pumps are restricted and running full bore, there would be a lot of energy going into the pumps that is wasted. Mr. Luetchford suggested that this may be the next step.

Mr. Luetchford noted that this would be part of the energy saving items that would be discussed next on the agenda. Mr. Luetchford noted that you cannot permanently alter the variable frequency drives. Mr. Hornung noted that you could hard wire the pumps to run slow at that speed.

Mr. Crissman requested Mr. Luetchford to keep the Board posted on this matter.

Review of the Energy Study and Alternative Energy Feasibility Study for the Friendship Center  
Submission of DCNR grant application for Friendship Center energy enhancements

Mr. Luetchford distributed an Energy Conservation Study to the Board members proposed by HRG, Inc. He noted that he spoke of the possibility of using solar energy as an alternative energy source. He noted that first; he needed to review the entire facility to determine what the energy consumption rate is for various items, such as lights, HVAC, pool pumps, etc. He noted that he wanted to find where the facility could conserve energy, and that is indicated on page three.

Mr. Luetchford noted page 13 contains a simple cost analysis that the engineer compiled looking at different projects that could be done. He noted that it lists roughly 20 possible projects. He noted that the list includes the estimated energy reduction potential, estimated utility cost savings per year, and the payback period. He noted that some of these projects are ongoing, such as the replacement of the shower heads. He noted that it was estimated to cost \$3,000 to replace the shower heads, but he did it for a few hundred dollars by placing a water restrictor in the shower head. He noted that the current flow rate is 4 gallons per minute, and the restrictor would reduce it to 2.5 gallons per minutes, and save almost half the cost of water and electricity to heat the water.

Mr. Luetchford noted that he is looking into a spa cover to prevent the loss of heat from the spa. He noted that he is looking for a cover that the lifeguards could safely remove and replace without damaging it. He noted that some of the lobby and social hall lighting system has been replaced with compact fluorescent lights. He noted that the lights in the hallway and in front of the vending machines have been replaced and it improved the lighting for the area, and he hoped to replace the costs within five years. Mr. Seeds questioned if the bulbs should be replaced as they burn out. Mr. Luetchford noted that the bulbs have been in the fixtures for quite a while. Mr. Wolfe noted that the bulbs lose their ability to illuminate over time and they change color. He noted that only changing the burned out bulbs would result in different lighting in the area, and suggested that it is best to do it all at once. He explained that it is estimated that the current lights lose 40% of the light output in the first year, whereas, compact fluorescent lights only lost 5%. He noted that only the lights in the hallway have been replaced, as it would be more expensive to replace the lights in the gym. Mr. Luetchford explained that he is looking into purchasing a retrofit kit for the wall lights in the fitness center and social hall.

Mr. Luetchford explained that he is looking at the projects that have less than ten years for a payback period to fund in the application grant for DCNR. He noted that he has developed a scope of work for the FC to be included within a DCNR grant that would provide for a quick payback. He noted, on page three, he has listed eight projects that could provide an annual savings of \$55,455. He noted that he would request half of the total amount of cost, \$210,062 for the grant, with the Township providing the 50% match in funds. He noted that he showed the report to the regional manager at DCNR and she stated that she believes that the study and accompanying documents would be sufficient for the DCNR grant. He requested permission to proceed with the grant application.

Mr. Luetchford noted that he would be applying for grants for the skate park, Wolfersberger Tract planning, and energy conservation for the Friendship Center. Mr. Seeds noted that the matching funds would have to come from the General Fund. Mr. Luetchford noted that the Township would have to budget for it in the 2010 budget. Mr. Luetchford noted with the Economic Stimulus package, there may be additional funding for some of these projects. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township may only be approved for the energy conservation grant for the Friendship Center.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the pool filter is used to backwash the water. Mr. Luetchford noted that the engineers were looking at energy savings only. He noted that the two issues are the very low frequency that drives the flow pumps and the pool filter backwash. He noted that there are issues with sanitation involved also. He noted that the backwash is done with the existing pool water and it is replaced with new water. He noted that there are many Total Dissolved Solids (TDS) issues, and putting people in a pool, you end up with a build up of TDS in the pool, and that water must be renewed. He noted that the engineers did not consider that at all, as they were only looking at the energy costs. He noted that the FC could save \$21,000 a year if the pumps are slowed down, but that would be slowing them down to the State minimum filtration level. He noted if he did that he would have stinky pools. He explained that the pumps work twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week, and it would make sense to slow the pumps down for a small period of time.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the static plate energy recovery was for the exhaust fans in the locker room. Mr. Luetchford answered that it is a heat exchanger that takes the exhaust air in the HVAC unit out of the locker room and exhausts it into the air, replacing it with cold air, in the winter time, and reheating it from zero degrees to 70 degrees. He noted that a more economic way to do this is to take the hot air, coming out of the locker rooms, and have a heat exchanger

that would take the cold air and warm it before it gets to the heaters. Mr. Seeds questioned if it would be stale air coming out of the locker rooms. Mr. Wolfe explained that the air itself goes out, only the heat stays in.

Mr. Hornung questioned why turning off the pumps and turning them back on would burn up the pumps. Mr. Luetchford noted that the electrician told him that it would not be good to stop the pumps, but you could slow them down. He noted that the variable frequency drives on the pumps are not set up for variable speeds. He noted that they would work, but they also would burn out much earlier, noting that the pumps are replaced every six to seven years. Mr. Hornung noted that he has never seen a pump that would burn up because it was turned on and off. Mr. Ted Robertson noted that it depends on the suction head, whether it is a positive or negative suction head. He noted if you have a positive suction head where there is pressure on the pump, it would not do too much damage, however, if you have a negative suction pump, where you have to bend the pump to pull the water up from a lower level, you could burn up a motor pretty quick. Mr. Luetchford explained that that is what is in use at the FC. Mr. Robertson noted as the pump goes on and off, the seal rings wear and you won't pull a vacuum and you won't pull the water up. Mr. Hornung noted that Mr. Luetchford stated that it would burn up the motor. Mr. Robertson noted that it would burn up the pump.

Mr. Seeds noted that heating the water from the pool with solar energy may be a consideration for the future. Mr. Luetchford noted that an alternative energy source would be to heat the pool water using solar energy.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the roof is a rubber roof. Mr. Luetchford answered that it is. Mr. Seeds noted that the building would be ten years old, and he questioned if the roof would have to be replaced, and he would have to determine how the solar panels would be connected to the roof. Mr. Seeds answered that a contractor would determine how to connect to the roof and what building structures there may be. Mr. Seeds noted that flat roofs are a problem. Mr. Wolfe noted that the FC is not completely flat, as it has a small pitch to it.

“Otta Know” Presentation: Only the Market Can Clean up the Chesapeake Bay

Mr. Wolfe noted that he supplied this information for the Board to review.

## **IMPROVEMENT GUARANTEES**

Mr. Hawk noted that there was one Improvement Guarantee.

### North Mountain Office Court, Building 2

A release in a bond with Travelers Casualty and Surety Company of America, in the amount of \$34,230.66.

Mr. Blain made a motion to approve the one listed Improvement Guarantee as presented.

Mr. Crissman seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous voice vote followed.

### **Adjournment**

There being no further business, Mr. Blain made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 9:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle  
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman  
Township Secretary