

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Board Meeting held May 12, 2009

A workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6:18 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; Lori Wissler, Community Development Manager; Watson Fisher and Ted Robertson, SWAN; Bill Bostic, Linglestown Gazette; Keith Cerzullo, Tom Swank, and Robert Dobslaw, Esquire.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Public Comment

No public comment was provided.

Request to amend the Zoning Ordinance to permit the
subdivision of condominium units into individual parcels of land

Mr. Stine noted that Robert Dobslaw is an attorney who represents the Balanced Development Group, who recently purchased the Schiavoni Development that was previously approved by the Board. He noted that the plan has been recorded at the Court House. He noted that it was approved as a condominium unit land development plan. He noted that Balanced Development Group wants to change the way the property is owned. He noted that the development is currently owned by a Condominium Association, and the developers want to change it to a Planned Community where all the units are owned by individuals, but due to the way financing is done these days, the banks don't want to finance condominiums where the land is all owned by a Condominium Association. He noted that the banks will only finance dwellings where there is some piece of the land that goes with the actual dwelling unit.

Mr. Stine explained to do that, the developer would have to set forth in their Declaration a certain amount of land, whether it is just the land that is under the building, something in addition to that, or whatever it may be. He noted that under the law for a planned community or a condominium association, it was understood that you would not have to do a subdivision plan because these fell under the Planned Community Act (PCA) and the Condominium Act (CA). He explained that Commonwealth Court recently changed this in the Frank Shaffer Case where they stated, that even if it is a planned community, if the units are to be divided up, by way of meets and bounds type description, that it is a subdivision, and must receive subdivision approval. He noted that the current developer has an approved land development plan for building, but now, he will need subdivision approval. He noted that the lots would not comply with the zoning ordinance since it is set up as a planned community. He noted that Mr. Dobslaw is present to discuss this with the Board members, noting that he may want to suggest some amendments to the zoning and subdivision ordinances that would remedy the situation.

Mr. Hawk noted that people have bought condominiums since this decision was made. Mr. Stine noted that the sale of the condominiums is not an issue, rather, since the banks have experienced the recent financial crises, they have reeled in their lending policies and apparently are not willing to lend money to purchase condominiums that don't have some land interest with them.

Mr. Hawk noted that up to this point it was never a problem. Mr. Crissman noted that condominiums have common space, having a prorated share of the common space.

Mr. Dobslaw noted that the issue is condominium or more correctly condominium units. He noted that the condominium is the entire parcel, whereas, the condominium units are the individual residence or in some cases commercial space that is sold. He noted that the issue of obtaining financing for units is part of the current problem on the Federal level. He noted that the lenders have become skittish because of what has happened, especially in Florida. He noted that they are reluctant to offer loans to individuals to purchase a condominium unit unless the community has been established, the association has been running, and everything is in place. He noted that this has nothing to do with what is already owned. Mr. Crissman noted that this only concerns the new development of condominiums. Mr. Dobslaw noted that it is not as big a problem, noting that it has to do with whether the community is under the control of the owners of the individual units or still under the control of the declarant, the person who creates the condominium.

Mr. Dobslaw noted that the issue concerns new condominiums or apartments that are converted to condominiums. He noted that this is the reason for looking at alternative ways to sell units. He noted that the alternative that most developers use is the planned community unit. He noted that a planned community is virtually identical to a condominium. He explained that there are two acts in Pennsylvania that address these individual units, the Uniform Condominium Act (UCA) and the Uniform Planned Community Act (UPCA). He noted that the two acts are virtually identical, intentionally, and that they were adopted by the Commonwealth based upon uniform laws. He noted that the intent was to offer alternatives but not a significant amount of difference. He explained that it is possible to create and sell planned community units, noting that the lenders do not have a problem with those types of units. He noted that it makes sense for a developer to switch the act under which the development is offered for sale, therefore, the entire parcel would be called a planned community, and the individual unit would be called a planned community unit. He noted that a unit can vary from an interior air space that is defined from wall to wall, ceiling to floor, noting that it could be a condominium unit or a planned community unit.

Mr. Dobslaw noted that both the UPCA and UCA, sometimes, go beyond the walls. He noted that sometimes they include the land under the residence. He noted that townhomes frequently are sold as planned community units with some land beneath the townhome, and the entire structure could be part of the unit. He noted that the buyer owns the structure, the land on which the structure sits, and roof. He noted that that is the alternative of choice today for most developers.

Mr. Dobslaw noted, for the past 33 years, the Commonwealth Court has held that the division of property into condominium units did not constitute a subdivision. He noted that the Commonwealth Court stated in 1975, that condominium is a form of ownership, and as such, it is not subject to municipal review. He noted that buildings have been converted to condominium units and that conversion process has not been submitted for municipal approval. He noted, if the units were built new, they would be submitted for municipal approval as a land development. He noted that the municipality reviews the arrangement of the buildings, distance setbacks, and distance from streets. He noted that the land development approval permitted the owner to rent the units or sell them as condominium units or to sell them as planned community units.

Mr. Dobslaw noted that the Commonwealth Court changed that when it ruled that the creation of units is a subdivision. He noted, if that was the only problem, he would be able to

address it very simply, however, the Commonwealth Court stated that the units are now lots which means that the unit from wall to wall, floor to ceiling, is now a lot. He noted that a lot is defined under the Municipalities Planning Code and zoning ordinances. He noted that most zoning ordinances do not have any provisions for a lot that is a part of a building. He noted that it is very hard to have a rear yard or street frontage for a lot that is on the seventh floor of a building, as this creates a conflict. He noted that the zoning ordinances must cover the ability to subdivide lots that are stacked, one on top of another.

Mr. Dobslaw noted that the governing law for both condominiums and planned communities does contain one other item. He noted that the law says that you can't treat a structure differently if it is held by one owner or divided up and sold as condominium units, or as a planned community. He noted that the design can't change or be required to change based upon whether it is a condominium or planned community. He noted that they must be interchangeable to be in compliance with both UPCA and UCA. He proposed that municipalities start considering the modification of ordinances to recognize that a lot could include a unit created under the UPCA or the UCA. He explained that this would change the definition of a lot. He noted that once this is done, then he must ensure that there can't be any difference in the mandated way in which the property is developed, which means a modification of the zoning ordinance and possibly SALDO to recognize that if a building is divided into units, and receives land development approval, the dividing of the building into either kind of unit would be as a subdivision and need approved. He noted that front yard, rear yard setbacks, and street frontage may have to be excluded as requirements for lots when the lots are units.

Mr. Dobslaw noted that this does not make sense and it creates a new interpretation. He noted that an appeal has been made before the Commonwealth Supreme Court, to return to the former rule. Mr. Crissman questioned what the status of the appeal process was. Mr. Dobslaw answered that the Supreme Court has not granted allocatur yet; it is still a petition for an allowance for appeal. He noted, if the Supreme Court denies the petition for appeal, then it would be the law unless the legislature steps in to rectify it. He noted, if the Supreme Court grants allocatur, then it would start the process. He suggested that he would not see an answer from the Supreme Court before the end of 2010, and the earliest oral arguments could be made would be late in 2009.

Mr. Dobslaw noted that the ordinance is now in conflict with the law, and if he follows the letter of the law, the developer cannot sell the units because they would be non-conforming lots. He noted that they would not meet the requirements set forth in the ordinance for a lot.

Mr. Wolfe questioned what other municipalities have done regarding this situation. Mr. Stine suggested that they have not paid any attention to it. He noted that a condo plan goes through the land development process and the Township never sees it again. He noted that Paxton Towne Centre was a land development plan, but he suggested that they did a site condominium after that. He noted that they did a declaration and divided up the entire plan into lots for the buildings, and the Township never saw the plan again. Mr. Dobslaw noted that under the Commonwealth Court decision, it is a subdivision and each unit is probably a non-conforming lot, and an illegal subdivision. He noted that the decision was made in October 2008, but it was not published until January 2009.

Mr. Dobslaw noted that Balanced Development is at the point that they are ready to start selling the residences, and it is prohibitive under the UCA, which has nothing to do with the zoning, and converting it to a planned community would create conflict with the ordinance because the units now become lots.

Mr. Hawk questioned what would happen if the Township did nothing, or what implications would there be if amendments are made. Mr. Stine noted if the Township does nothing, the developers are stuck and can't sell their product. He noted that anyone else who provides a plan for a planned community may be in the same boat, unless they make their planned community comply with the zoning and SALDO ordinance which defeats the purpose because you can't make much of a planned community since they are normally located close together.

Mr. Dobslaw provided a two-page summary of what he explained. He noted that the first page, as well as the first paragraph on the second page, spell out what he explained. He noted that the second half of page two is the recommendation which is to change the definition of a lot to include any unit created in accordance with the provisions of the Pennsylvania Uniform Planned Community Act (PUPCA) or the PCA. He noted that this would bring the ordinance into compliance with the decision of the court.

Mr. Hawk questioned what impact that would have for other types of development. Mr. Stine answered that it precludes what Paxton Towne Centre did. He noted that they could not do what they did unless they seek approval for a subdivision plan which would not be approved

since it would not meet the requirements of the ordinance. Mr. Crissman questioned who would challenge the developer. Mr. Stine noted that no one would challenge that plan since it is already in place.

Mr. Dobslaw noted that the first suggestion is to change the definition of a lot to include a unit created under the PUPCA or the PCA. He noted that the harder step is the one mandated by the requirement that you can't have two different requirements for the same building or development based upon the type of ownership. He noted that a unit created in accordance with either one of the above mentioned Acts does not have the same lot requirements as a lot created from the plan division. He noted that it would be very hard to do that when the lots are stacked or arranged differently. He suggested that the solution would be to indicate, by ordinance revision, that the approval by the governing body of the land development plan constitutes approval if that property is divided into units in accordance with the PUPCA or PCA. He noted that it would put the ordinance in compliance with the law interpreted by the Commonwealth Court and would not disturb the approval process that is currently used so that the same review procedure stays in place. He noted that the project would be submitted under the land development ordinance, and the owner has the option to rent the units or convert them into units as long as they are created under one of those Acts. He noted that the ordinance would deem it to be an approved subdivision.

Mr. Crissman questioned, from the consumers position, if a person buys the condo which is more than studs to studs because you would also get a portion of the frontage, back or whatever, how does that get defined and how does that play out later on regarding the association and what each person owns. Mr. Dobslaw noted that none of what he described would change the procedure under either Act. Mr. Dobslaw noted that this is already in place, noting that it does not change that both types of communities are subject to complex laws which preempt the issues of who owns what. He noted that for a condo, a unit owner owns whatever the declaration says they own. It is dimensioned by a plat and plan that is recorded. He noted that some condo owner's own stud to stud while others own a piece of ground, but it is defined in their declaration and their plats and plans.

Mr. Crissman questioned how it would be the same for a five or six story condo. He noted that you can't state that the owner of unit 703 owns the ground below 703, since there are six owners below him. Mr. Crissman noted that the owners own stud to stud and the association owns the land. Mr. Dobslaw noted, under the UCA, there is a difference, noting everything but

the unit is owned jointly, however, under the UPCA, everything other than the unit is owned by a homeowner's association and that is owned by the residents. He noted that the changes that he is suggesting would not impact the buyer because what the buyer owns, a three-dimension block of air or water doesn't change. He noted that the Commonwealth Court did not change anything in either the UPCA or UCA; the only thing they said was that the units are not lots as defined.

Mr. Seeds noted that calling them lots requires setbacks and would mess up the system. Mr. Stine noted that it wouldn't if it was tailored to lots as created by a development that is under the UPCA or UCA. He noted that it would limit the lots to those two acts only. He noted that it would have to be very specific. Mr. Seeds questioned if it would have an affect on common areas. Mr. Stine noted that it would be governed by the declaration and the declarant rights.

Mr. Hawk noted that an adjustment must be made to the Township ordinances. Mr. Stine noted that it would be true unless the Supreme Court overturns the Commonwealth Court, but it could be more than two years from now, and these developers don't want to wait two years.

Mr. Wolfe questioned who prepares what. Mr. Stine noted that Mr. Dobslaw has offered to prepare a draft document.

Mr. Crissman questioned what other municipalities have addressed and adopted these amendments. Mr. Dobslaw answered that he is not aware of any, and the Township may be the first. Mr. Hawk requested Mr. Dobslaw to prepare the language for the ordinance change. Mr. Stine noted that when Mr. Dobslaw prepares a draft, it should be forwarded to the Planning Commission for review.

The developer questioned what he could do at this time. Mr. Wolfe questioned if anyone has thought to sponsor legislation regarding this issue. Mr. Dobslaw noted that he has been in touch with Hap Campbell, an attorney who represents the Builders Association. He noted that if no change comes from the courts, then he would prepare legislation to clarify the issue. He noted that the Acts are very specific, noting that the creation of a planned community or the creation of a condo out of an entire parcel of ground shall not constitute a subdivision or land development for purposes of ordinances.

Mr. Hawk suggested that Mr. Dobslaw should contact Lou Bianchi, who is a lobbyist for the Builder's Association. Mr. Dobslaw noted that he would probably experience the same time issue, trying to get something through the legislature at this time. Mr. Hawk suggested that the budget is the most important issue at this time.

Mr. Dobslaw questioned if his client could proceed with sales, as it would take several months to go through the ordinance change process. He noted that there is nothing that states that they can't sell their lots, unless someone brings an action. The developer explained that he could sell units as condos; however, the buyers are unable to acquire financing because of the label condominium. He noted that the subdivision would allow him to change the declaration to a planned unit, and if he did that, then he would be in the middle of the conflict. Mr. Stine noted that they would have to do a new declaration, and file a plat that shows what the planned units are. He noted that they would be shown as having land in them, and as soon as they do that, they immediately have an illegal subdivision. He noted that the Board could bring enforcement action against them.

Mr. Hornung questioned if there was a way to fix it to allow them to sell units as condos for now. Mr. Dobslaw noted that the developer would be in violation if he sold the units as condo units due to the definition of unit. He noted that the buyers are not going to be able to buy those condo units due to the current market place for mortgages. He noted if they put up a sign stating that they are selling new planned community units, they could take agreements, but not file the declaration. Mr. Stine noted that they could not close, but they could start the selling process. Mr. Hornung questioned how close the developer was to selling units. The developer answered inside of 30 days. Mr. Hawk noted that he did not know if the Township could solve the problem within 30 days, but the sooner Mr. Dobslaw gets the language to the Township, the sooner it could start the process. He noted if the case goes to the Supreme Court and it is overturned, then it would make the entire process moot.

Mr. Stine questioned if the developer could take an agreement of sale and sell it as a planned community if he didn't have a declaration for a planned community. He questioned if it would be a violation of the Act. Mr. Dobslaw noted that it would not because the definition of a declarant is someone who is selling a unit that has been created or to be created. He noted that he would have to represent and disclose to the buyers. Mr. Stine questioned if he would have to show the buyer a copy of a draft declaration. Mr. Dobslaw answered yes, with the appropriate disclosures, subject to municipal approval. He noted that it would allow his developer to start marketing, not as condominiums, but the buyers could secure financing, noting that financing takes time, and it would provide him with 60 to 90 days to make the text amendment change.

Mr. Hawk noted that he wished he could solve the problem tonight but that is not possible.

Mr. Dobslaw explained that he has been representing the Frank Shaffer Family Limited Partnership case, pro bono, since the beginning, and it has become his retirement hobby. He noted that Judge Pellegrini suggested, in oral argument, that perhaps Mr. Dobslaw should be arrested.

Mr. Hornung noted that throughout the Commonwealth, people have not stopped selling condominiums, and he questioned what is being done. The developer answered that many of the developers have changed over to planned units, and are unknowingly, in the middle of this conflict. Mr. Stine noted that people will be writing title policies on these things, without knowing that these things are illegal subdivisions. He noted that something is going to happen, and there will be many title claims. He noted that the Commonwealth Court decision raises horrendous questions for the buyer and the municipalities. He noted that it is not affecting the sale of planned communities because the lenders read those as traditional and don't have the condominium label. He noted that many are going forward with these plans unaware that what they are doing is an illegal subdivision. He noted, if no one raises the issue, then no one is enforcing it. Mr. Hawk suggested that they may get stopped at the bank. Mr. Dobslaw noted that surprisingly, banks are not as thorough in their reviews.

Mr. Hornung questioned, if the law was reversed, could the developer revert back to condominiums. Mr. Dobslaw answered that he could do that, that he could terminate a planned community or condominium and then re-declare the alternative, but there would be no benefit to do it. He noted that the problem with condominiums is not with the municipal end, it is with the lender end. Mr. Stine noted, if the Supreme Court reverses the decision, it would solve their problem, and the ordinance change is of no use, at that point.

Mr. Hornung questioned, to change to a planned community, would the plan have to come back to the Board for approval with drawings. Mr. Stine answered that the plan has already been approved as a land development plan, and that's what they have to build. He explained that the way the developer would change the plan from a condo to a planned community is by declaration that is recorded in the Recorder of Deeds, and the plan would not have to come back to the Township for review as long as they build what's set forth on the land development plan.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Township needs to bring its ordinance into compliance with their plans.

Mr. Blain suggested having Mr. Dobslaw prepare a draft, bring it to the Board for its review and do what is necessary to move it along. Mr. Hornung noted that a sense of urgency should be used in the process.

Mr. Crissman questioned how long it would take Mr. Dobslaw to get his draft together. Mr. Dobslaw questioned when the Board meets next. Mr. Crissman stated that it meets next Monday. Mr. Stine noted that it would have to be brought before the Planning Commission first. Ms. Wissler noted that the Planning Commission meets tomorrow night. Mr. Crissman suggested that it should be added to their agenda for tomorrow night's meeting. Ms. Wissler noted that she would call Mr. Dobslaw to provide a time frame for tomorrow night.

Continued review of the Length of Service Awards Program
proposed for volunteer firefighters

Mr. Wolfe noted that Keith Cerzullo and Tom Swank are present to discuss the Length of Service Awards Program (LOSAP) with the Board members. Mr. Wolfe noted that this was last discussed at a workshop meeting in January 2009, and it appeared that not all members in attendance were in agreement to the plan. He noted that further discussions were held regarding the LOSAP and the issues were worked out, and, at this time, he has prepared a final draft of where the plan is now.

Mr. Wolfe noted that his memorandum details the current status of the plan. He noted on January 13, 2009, he provided the Board with a copy of a resolution that amended the Fire Equipment Capital Fund, taking the annual allocation from \$250,000 to \$200,000, with the remaining \$50,000 to be allocated to a LOSAP fund, with an additional \$10,000 to come from another fund. He noted that he included a plan document, an ordinance creating the LOSAP, and the actuarial study.

Mr. Wolfe noted that tab two in the Board's packet contains a draft resolution that would create a LOSAP fund. He noted that there have been no changes to this resolution. He noted that once the Board creates the fund and deposits money into the fund, it is no longer the Board's to take back. He noted that it becomes the property of the Lower Paxton Township Fire Company, which entails all three fire companies. He noted that the money in the Fire Equipment Capital Fund is still the Township's money, and the amount and use could be amended.

Mr. Wolfe noted that tab three contains the proposed ordinance to create the LOSAP. He noted that he highlighted a few items in yellow that were changed. He noted that, previously, at

the January meeting, the Fire Police Officers were added to the LOSAP. He explained, in the middle of page one, it shows that a point system was added to determine the qualifications for an active firefighter, using the same qualifications required from the new legislation at the State level, Act 66 of 2008. He noted that that act set up a personal income tax deduction rebate for volunteer firefighters in Pennsylvania, and that the Township is marrying these criteria to the LOSAP with some minor amendments.

Mr. Wolfe noted on page two, item number three, identifies how a firefighter is defined. He noted that a firefighter must be a member in good standing, meet any of the additional requirements established by the fire company to be a member, meet the qualifications of Act 66 of 2008, and earn at least five points in response to fire and rescue activities. He noted that under Act 66, a person could be an active volunteer and never respond to a call. He noted, at the committee level, it was found to be important that an active volunteer for purposes of this award had to have at least some response time.

Mr. Wolfe noted that each qualifying person must achieve 50 points, and at least five points have to be from response activities. Mr. Crissman questioned if someone joined in October, they would have to get 50 points to get credit for that year. Mr. Wolfe noted that a volunteer could not join late in the year and get 50 points, since it includes training, attending company meetings, etc. Mr. Crissman noted if a volunteer only achieved 47 credits, he would not earn a credit for that year. Mr. Wolfe noted that all of the firefighters are already using this criterion to qualify for a personal income tax exemption. Mr. Cerzullo explained that Mr. Swank found the information and brought it the group's attention.

Mr. Wolfe noted, on page three, there are some gray highlights. He noted that in discussions held since January, the plan benefit has been reduced from \$12 per month to \$10 per month, per year of service from a maximum total of \$300 to a maximum total of \$250.

Mr. Wolfe noted that tab four shows the actuarial study and the reason for the reduction in the plan benefit. He explained that the fire companies took a second look at their company rosters and came up with a new list to include the fire police officers, and individuals who are over age 65. He noted that the list added 20 additional members; therefore, a new actuarial study dated March 16, 2009, was completed. He noted on page three, scenario F-15, which matched the scenario used the previous time, provides for a \$10 per-month per-year of service benefit for a maximum of 25 years of service, at a total cost on an annual basis of \$60,407. He noted that the plan benefit is \$407 over the allocated amount. He noted, previously, the fund amount was

\$59,000 at the \$12 per month, with a maximum total of \$300. He explained that a new list of potential participants is attached to the plan document.

Mr. Wolfe noted that a change was made in the plan to accommodate those volunteers who are 65 years of age now, noting that under the previous ordinance, they would not be able to qualify. He noted that they would be able to qualify under this plan after a five-year vesting period.

Proposed resolution establishing a LOSAP Fund
Proposed ordinance establishing a LOSAP, including Act 66 provisions
3/16/09 LOSAP Plan actuarial valuation

Proposed LOSAP plan document

Mr. Wolfe explained that the LOSAP plan would be the document handed to the volunteers, noting that it lists the amount of the benefit, which is \$10 per month, with a maximum amount of \$250. He noted that the document is pretty much the same as was reviewed previously. He noted that page four lists the amount of points for each category that a volunteer could earn. Chief Cerzullo noted that there are nine categories in which a volunteer could earn points, and some are permanently maintained. He noted that once a volunteer is certified, he/she may keep those points as credit to be used each year after. He noted that a volunteer could actually obtain 50 points without ever getting on a fire truck; however, this defeats the purpose of a recruitment or retention plan for firefighters or fire police officers. He explained that the plan provides for five mandatory points for attendance at fire calls, noting that it is a percentage for fire calls. He noted that the formula for earning points is listed in the fire response rate. Mr. Hornung questioned if a volunteer earned 40%, what would it come out to in points. Chief Cerzullo answered that it would be 25 points. Mr. Hornung questioned if it was one point for each percentage point. Chief Cerzullo noted that the way the Commonwealth set up the plan, a person could only earn so many points in each category since they want the volunteer to be involved in a little bit of everything. He noted that a volunteer could only earn so many points in each category. He noted that the LOSAP Plan added the requirement for incident response.

Chief Cerzullo explained that the Commonwealth developed a calculator for how this works, and all the members have to do is to plug in numbers. He noted that he did the calculations for all his firefighters and handed it out to them to take to their tax preparer. He noted that it was very easy for the member to obtain their goals. He explained that all of his

firefighters are Fire Fighter One; therefore, the system awarded each ten points. He noted, if a volunteer has an additional certification, he/she could earn 20 points, and a volunteer would only need 25 more points to reach the goal of 50. He noted that all the firefighters for 2008 would receive credit for the 2009 year season.

Mr. Crissman questioned who would do the accounting for each volunteer and who maintains the records to determine who would qualify. Mr. Wolfe answered that the ordinance established that the chief and president must certify, to the Township, all firefighters that meet the criteria. He noted that it must be a notarized certification. Mr. Crissman questioned if there would be written documentation for each individual. Mr. Seeds questioned if there would be an appeals process. Mr. Wolfe answered that it would not be to the Township, rather to the individual Fire Company.

Chief Cerzullo noted that most of the reporting would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis by the Committee. He explained, if a firefighter is off duty due to an injury for a period of time, that would reduce his percentage of calls. He explained, if Colonial Park responded to 500 calls, and you would subtract the two months that the volunteer was unable to report for duty, that would reduce the number of calls, therefore, his percentage would be the same. He noted that his down time would not be held against him. Mr. Seeds noted if a firefighter was on Worker's Compensation due to an injury sustained at a fire scene, they would receive credit for the year.

Mr. Hornung questioned if this program would provide some motivation for volunteers to join and report for calls. Chief Cerzullo suggested that he might get some extra volunteers, and it may retain some of the current firefighters longer. He noted that he is looking for a means to keep the volunteers in active service, and stated that the LOSAP is not a fix for a membership drive. He noted that membership drives must continue. Mr. Hawk suggested that most people volunteer because they want to be involved in the service that firefighters provide. Mr. Swank noted that he volunteers as a firefighter because he likes to do it, not for the \$250 LOSAP contribution.

Mr. Wolfe noted that much has changed for the fire services in a short period of time. The Township has implemented a LOSAP program, there is a State Tax credit program, all three fire companies have good facilities, and two fire companies sponsor live-ins students. He noted that the equipment is up to date, and many steps have been taken to secure volunteers for the fire companies.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the LOSAP would motivate the current membership to stay. He noted that in any organization, a small percentage of volunteers do 90% of the work, and he questioned if the purpose of the LOSAP is to get volunteers that may participate more to alleviate the workload. Chief Cerzullo answered that this was not the driving force in establishing the LOSAP. He explained that if he was not involved in the fundraising aspect of the program, he did not think that it would push him to get the points to be more involved in fundraising. He noted that having someone get on his case would make him show up more.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the 50 points was too low a goal, and may not provide enough incentive to get more quality work from the volunteers. Chief Cerzullo noted that he has 20 active firefighters, and they are the one's who attend the training, the fundraising, noting that his fire company does not have a large social active membership, unlike Colonial Park and Linglestown Fire Companies. He noted that he is the second oldest in time and service for Paxtonia Fire Company, and Paxtonia does not have a large base that started the fire company. He noted that Colonial Park and Linglestown has volunteers who have been members since the horse-drawn days. He noted that the LOSAP follows the State program, but it does not mean that changes could not be made and the number could be raised in the future. Mr. Crissman noted that he is trying to make the program more beneficial for the fire companies and if they think the bar is too low, then they may need to raise it to get more people involved in more of the areas. He noted that he likes the program because it provides for a well rounded volunteer involved in various aspects of the fire company.

Mr. Swank explained that he wished that training was all that he had to worry about, but the other items needed to be added because the fire companies must continue to conduct fundraisers.

Mr. Seeds noted that he was happy with the funding as it does not exclude anyone. Chief Cerzullo noted that that is what they were trying to accomplish with the program. Mr. Hornung questioned if the bar was raised or lowered, who would make those decisions. Chief Cerzullo noted that there is no official committee, however, once this LOSAP is accepted, there is a need for an official committee. Mr. Wolfe noted that, ultimately, the Board would oversee the program. Chief Cerzullo noted that there would be, at a minimum, one representative from each fire company, who would meet with George, and whoever else is on the Committee. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be operated in a similar fashion to the police and non-union pension committees. He noted that the LOSAP Committee would meet on a regular basis, overview the

plan and investments, provide information to the members, and make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Hornung questioned who would be designated to be on the LOSAP Committee. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Board would, noting that the information for this is found on page four, paragraph 13, of the Ordinance.

Mr. Swank noted that, as far as raising the bar, from his stand point, the Township is getting all that he could provide. He noted that he has two sons who play sports and he needs to spend time with his family. Mr. Wolfe noted that the intention was to help the fire companies maintain volunteers.

Mr. Seeds noted, in Section three, page three, item nine, it states that the Township shall review the certifications of prior years service credit furnished as required herein and approve the certification thereof by no later than May 15, 2009. He noted that the date would need to be changed. Chief Cerzullo noted that this information was already forwarded to the Township. He noted that Paxtonia and Colonial Park have provided their notarized letters to the Township, but he did not know if Linglestown had submitted their information. Mr. Wolfe noted that the LOSAP would be retroactive to January 1, 2008.

Mr. Seeds noted that the chart in Section four, for the Revised Actuarial Study as of January 1, 2009, has a footnote that states that a one-time exception to the age 65 limitation applies to individuals with years of service prior to December 31, 2008. He questioned if that was the wrong date. Mr. Swank noted that there are seven members who are above 65 or would be before that date, therefore, it was important to include them. Mr. Swank noted that the date was correct.

Mr. Crissman noted that the plan is retroactive to July 2008, and he questioned if the funds were deposited into the plan for 2008 and 2009. Mr. Wolfe answered yes.

Mr. Seeds questioned for Section five, page three, last paragraph, if a volunteer who is on Worker's Compensation would be considered to be an active participant during that time. Mr. Wolfe answered that it would pertain if the volunteer is on Worker's Compensation for a fire related injury.

Mr. Seeds questioned if, for instance, Mr. Lee Witman, who is in his late 70's, would have to compete three and a half more years as an active firefighter or fire police officer. Mr. Wolfe noted that he could not be a social member only. Chief Cerzullo noted that he would be credited for 25 years of service, twenty years of past service, and five years in the plan.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the fire companies would be doing mid-year reviews to keep the volunteers abreast of their standing. Mr. Swank answered yes. He noted that a volunteer would have two years to make up the difference.

Mr. Blain noted that it is a great plan.

Mr. Wolfe explained that he would advertise the Ordinance, and after action is taken on the Ordinance, then the Board would need to act on the Resolution to create the fund.

Mr. Wolfe questioned if all three fire companies are in agreement. Mr. Swank answered that they are fine. Chief Cerzullo noted that he emailed all three fire companies and asked if they were in agreement to the plan.

Mr. Blain noted that during the last meeting that the LOSAP was discussed, the members from the Linglestown Fire Company left in disgust. Chief Cerzullo suggested that there was a lack of communication between the Committee member and the fire company. He noted that he was told that Linglestown was good to go with the plan. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would provide notice to all three fire companies of the night of the public hearing and anticipated action on the ordinance. Mr. Crissman stated that he hoped that representatives from all three fire companies would be present. Mr. Swank noted that Mr. Crum was not present at the meeting since he had to work. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would also notify the Public Safety Committee.

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

Mr. Wolfe noted that the discussion is centered on whether fees would be charged to residents or commercial haulers to dump leaf waste at the compost facility, as well as the taking away of leaf waste, which would include compost or wood chips, when available from the Public Works Department.

Mr. Wolfe explained that he has prepared a Resolution, which sets forth the parameters establishing the use for the compost facility, as to who would participate, to include Lower Paxton and West Hanover Townships, how the leaf waste is delivered to the compost facility, not only by Waste Management and West Hanover Township, but also for individuals and commercial haulers. He noted that he referenced the State enabling act and the Township's codified ordinance, which have been designed to implement PA ACT 101 of 1988. He noted in the Township's codified ordinances, the Board has the ability to establish a fee for all persons collecting trash, refuse, solid waste, and recyclables. He explained that leaf waste is considered

to be a recyclable. He noted that a fee could be charged, as per a Resolution set by the Board. He noted that an annual permit to transport and deliver leaf waste to the Township's compost facility shall be obtained by residents and landscape businesses, noting that this is the enabling language to set the fees.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the first fee is for individuals, an annual permit in the amount of \$20 per calendar year, allows a resident to use the compost facility anytime it is open to deposit an unlimited amount of leaf waste, and to take away compost and wood chips when available. Mr. Seeds questioned what the quantity would be. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be regulated by rules and regulations, not by ordinance, as set forth by the Health Officer.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there would be a permit fee for commercial haulers, at \$300 per calendar year, and given that this would be the initial year of inception, a pro-rated amount from August 1, 2009 until December 31, 2009, would be set at \$150 for commercial and \$10 for residential customers.

Mr. Wolfe noted that a permit allows the unlimited deposit of leaf waste, and the taking away of wood chips and compost, in accordance with rules and regulations developed by the Health Officer.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he also included a one-time fee in the amount of \$5, to deposit and take away material. He noted that, for a commercial hauler, the fee would be \$25. Mr. Blain questioned the definition of one-time. He questioned if the vehicle pulls in and drops off material; would that be considered a one-time use. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mr. Blain noted if a person is doing a significant amount of work around their home, it may take more than one trip in a day to dump the material, then the person would have to pay \$5 per stop. Mr. Wolfe answered that it would be better for them to buy the \$20 annual pass.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the administrative processing would be done at the Municipal Center, where a person could purchase a window sticker so a Community Service Officer (CSO) could view it as the vehicle pulled into the facility. He noted, for a one-time drop off, a tag would be sold. Mr. Crissman questioned if a person could purchase a ticket at the compost facility on a Saturday. Mr. Wolfe answered that no money would be collected at the compost facility. Mr. Blain questioned if the \$5 ticket should be for a day, and not one stop. Mr. Wolfe answered that it was up to the Board to make that decision. Mr. Hornung noted that the con would be that someone may save up a lot of waste to dump, ten times in one day, as well as the person who could only fit so much stuff in their trunk and has to make several trips. He suggested that the

person making numerous trips should only pay \$5; however, there is the potential for abuse. Mr. Wolfe noted that there would be trouble verifying that the person paid the \$5 if he/she continues to come back several times a day.

Mr. Hornung questioned how a person would be given an unlimited pass for one day, especially when there may be more than one person working at the facility. Mr. Crissman noted, that if he wanted to get rid of his leaf waste, he would not think about coming to the Township building first to get a pass, as he would go straight to the facility, and then argue with the attendant, wanting to know why they would not take his money. He noted that he did not like that system. Mr. Wolfe noted that there is no mechanism for employees to make change or document a payment. Mr. Blain noted that anytime someone collects cash, there is an opportunity for theft. Mr. Hornung suggested that the Township could provide the online purchase of a pass. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township does not have the ability to do online transactions at this time. Mr. Blain noted that the Sewer Authority has the capability to do this. Mr. Wolfe explained that there is an additional \$3.95 service fee added to the bill for the service, therefore, a person would be paying \$8.95, when the one-day cost was only \$5. Mr. Crissman noted, if a person was working at home on a Saturday, it would not be convenient if the person was unable to purchase a one-day pass, on the same day when the compost facility is open. Mr. Hornung noted that local businesses could sell the one-day passes. Mr. Crissman noted that that was a great idea. Mr. Hornung noted that he sells dog licenses for Dauphin County. Mr. Blain noted that the one-day pass should be for the entire day, and not one trip. Mr. Hornung noted that the pass could be dated for a specific day only. Mr. Hawk noted if a person is a frequent user, it would be to their benefit to purchase a yearly pass. Mr. Seeds noted that some people may want to pick up compost. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township makes no guarantees that compost material would be available.

Mr. Seeds questioned what would happen to the material that is available at Koons Park. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Township is going to stop supplying material at that location as it is a mess. Mr. Crissman questioned what would happen if a person purchases a day pass to only pick up materials and none is available. Mr. Wolfe noted that the availability of material has never been guaranteed. Mr. Hawk questioned if a person would have to pay \$5 to pick up material. Mr. Wolfe answered yes, because the pass would be the person's entrance ticket to the facility. He noted that the pass would provide for unlimited dumping, and the taking of materials, if available.

Mr. Blain questioned if the hours of operation would change. He noted that when the facility is closed, and residents have material, Waste Management will pick up the material. Mr. Wolfe noted that all residents have free leaf waste pick up at curbside, once every two weeks. He noted that the residents do not have to pay extra for this service. Mr. Crissman noted that he has not had to go to the facility this year, noting that he has been able to place all his leaf waste at curbside. Mr. Hawk noted that the only inconvenience is that you must store the leaf waste until collection day. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Robbins would like to increase the hours of operation, however, he would argue against it due to the numerous complaints received from the Hodges Heights' neighbors. Mr. Blain noted that he did not want to increase the hours, only the days of operations. Mr. Wolfe noted that increasing the numbers of days of operations would increase the hours of operations. He noted if it would be increased for longer hours in the day or more days of the week, the neighbors would find it a greater inconvenience. He noted that the facility impacts are noise, dust, and people who drive through their neighborhood with material falling off their vehicles. Mr. Hornung noted that imposing fees may help to curtail some of these problems, as it may reduce the amount of traffic. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be good for the Township if it generates a little money, however, most residents let Waste Management pick up their materials.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there has been any other complaints regarding this program, other than Mr. Roberts. Mr. Wolfe noted that his was the only one.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would like to put this item on the agenda for the next business meeting, adopt the resolution with a six-week intensive notification process, and see what happens. He noted that it may not work, and would provide the Township time to rescind the resolution if needed.

Mr. Seeds questioned if he could go to the facility with his pickup truck and get a load of mulch. Mr. Wolfe noted that there is some available at this time. Mr. Seeds questioned if that would change once the resolution was adopted. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Township may restrict the amount of material a person could take to make it available for everyone, and to sell it in bulk at cost. Mr. Seeds noted if the hours were extended, the Township would lose money, since the estimate of income is only \$24,000. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is his desire that the program build a revenue stream.

Mr. Hornung explained, if the Township decided to let businesses sell the passes, Dauphin County allows the vendor to charge a dollar or fifty cents extra to pay for the costs. Mr.

Wolfe noted that a store would be in a better position to sell the passes than the Township would be. He noted that it could be advertised that the passes are available at businesses throughout the Township. Mr. Crissman noted that it would become a more customer friendly program. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Hornung sold more yard waste bags than the Township ever did. Mr. Hornung noted that he sells more dog licenses than anyone in Dauphin County.

Mr. Blain questioned what the anticipated revenue from this program would be. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Robbins' estimate is \$24,000 for the \$20 passes, and \$4,000 for commercial users. Mr. Blain questioned what the cost would be to administer the program. Mr. Wolfe noted that the administrative work would occur at the Municipal Center, having customers pay at the window to receive an annual or day pass. He noted that passes could be purchased by mail, noting that it will work in a similar manner as when the Township processes the yard waste program. He noted that the only cost would be the printing of the stickers or passes.

Mr. Wolfe noted that rules and regulations would be posted as to what size of materials could be brought to the facility.

Mr. Hornung suggested that after six months, the program should be evaluated, to determine what the costs are to administer it. Mr. Blain noted that there would be a cost to administer the program in-house, and suggested that there would be additional costs along the way. He noted that he would not want to hire a staff person to administer the program. Mr. Wolfe noted that charging a fee would make citizens aware that nothing is free, and that they do not have a free place to dump their yard waste. He explained that residents do not understand that the grinder cost the Township \$400,000 and personnel is working that grinder three or four days a week, as well as staffing a CSO at the site three or four days a week costs money. He noted that the residents need to understand if they want services it will cost money.

Mr. Hornung noted that if Mr. Blain feels the way he does, maybe the Township should look to close the operations to the public. Mr. Blain noted that the Township is required to offer this service. Mr. Hornung questioned if the Township is required to have it open to the public. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township is required to provide for the recycling of leaf waste. Mr. Hornung noted that the Township provides that service by allowing unlimited service at curbside. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township could close the site for public use. Mr. Hornung questioned if it would save manpower. Mr. Wolfe answered that it would save the cost of staffing a CSO for three days. Mr. Hornung questioned what the overall savings would be. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it would be a savings of \$10,000 in manpower over a year.

Mr. Crissman questioned what would the Township do with the mulch. Mr. Hornung noted that some of it is sold. Mr. Wolfe explained that the Township could wholesale it, and that would make the Hodges Heights neighbors very happy.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Wendle had an idea for a green energy efficiency project to develop a solar farm on the land fill and sell the electricity to the Swatara Treatment Plant, which is in a radius that allows for a greater credit. He noted that the land is elevated, faces south, and it is cleared, and there is ten plus acres. He noted that he was at the facility today for 45 minutes and roughly 15 to 20 people dropped material at the site. He noted that the facility is used heavily, and closing the facility would result in 15 to 20 vehicles, per hour on certain days, which would not drive through the Hodges Heights neighborhood.

Mr. Hornung noted if the \$5 or \$20 pass is implemented and not used, then the program could be shut down. Mr. Hornung questioned why people continue to bring their leaf waste when it could be picked up at their homes every two weeks. Mr. Blain suggested that 5% of the citizens use the facility, noting that it is probably the same people using it all the time. Mr. Seeds noted that he gathers the branches at his house and property, and stated that it was easier to put the leaf waste in his pickup truck than to store it and carry it to the curbside. He noted that he would buy a sticker.

Mr. Blain noted that he is not advocating closing the facility, but he wants to make sure that it does not become a costly program. Mr. Seeds questioned if \$5 is enough to charge. He suggested that you could justify charging more than \$20 per year. Mr. Blain suggested trying the project for a six-month period to see how it works.

Mr. Crissman questioned if there was a place that a citizen could call to find out if mulch was available. Mr. Wolfe answered that a citizen could call the Municipal Center during the week, and on Saturdays, they could go to the facility to find out if any compost is available, and then purchase a day pass from a local business.

Discussion regarding the Township's efforts to stop the implementation of A Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) in the Paxton Creek drainage basin

Mr. Wolfe noted that, a year ago, the Township was surprised that the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was going to implement a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for the Paxton Creek, which would significantly affect the development potential of Lower Paxton

Township, Susquehanna Township and the City of Harrisburg. He noted that it also affects Swatara Township and Middle Paxton Township to a lesser degree.

Mr. Wolfe explained that the EPA held a public meeting at the Municipal Center on March 19, 2008, and staff only found out about that meeting the same day. He noted that the Township was very upset and expressed its concerns with the EPA, and the EPA met with the Township a second time, but it became very evident that the EPA was going to move forward, no matter what, to establish the TMDL for Paxton Creek for phosphorus, outside of the normal way, to establish a TMDL as has been described by legal counsel, John Hall.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township has been a participant in the battle with the EPA and Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) in implementing the TMDL. He noted that Susquehanna Township has participated some but has not paid any bills in 2009. He noted that the City of Harrisburg showed an interest but has no money to fund it, and the Harrisburg City Authority states that it is participating but never does. He noted that the Harrisburg Builders' Association has been very helpful in sponsoring meetings and trying to generate interest among the Realtors Association and Capital Region Economic Development Corporation (CREDC). He noted that they have also contributed some funds for the legal fees, and are a legal party to the litigation. He noted that the PA Municipal Authorities Association is a participant, as well as several State Representatives, as well as Senator Jeff Piccolo. He noted that Representative Ron Marsico has not been a participant.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the others are not participants because the Township is paying the bill. Mr. Wolfe answered that he did not know. He noted that Mr. Myers, from Susquehanna Township, told him today that they will probably pay the bills sometime this year.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township has paid \$28,000 this year, which is far more than expected, having paid a total of \$32,000 for all of last year. He noted that he requested Mr. Hall to provide an estimate of expected expenses for the year, and he provided an estimate of \$165,000. He noted that he did not know where to go with this situation, wondering if the Township was beyond the point of no return. He questioned if the Township should remove itself from the fight, knowing that the consequences could be very extreme and onerous. He noted that many of the municipal partners are starting to fall by the wayside.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the email from Mr. Hall with the projected costs should be sent to the other members who have not paid anything. Mr. Wolfe answered that the other Townships are getting the email updates, regardless if they are paying. Mr. Seeds questioned if

the \$165,000 is the Township's bill. Mr. Wolfe answered that it could be if the case goes to litigation. Mr. Seeds noted that he read somewhere in the memo, that something should be resolved by July. Mr. Wolfe noted that the issue could be resolved by July. He noted if the Township wins the peer review process then it would not cost as much. He questioned if the EPA could appeal the peer review process. Mr. Stine noted that it is the EPA's peer review process and he suggested that they would not appeal their own process.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Hall sent a letter to the Acting Secretary for DEP, dated April 14, 2009, that contains the most clear status for the entire issue. He noted on page one, it states that the appellants have had the opportunity to depose key DEP officials and, "from those depositions, DEP's written discovery responses have been providing clear, uncontroverted information showing that the TMDLs are (1) unnecessary, (2) will not correct the stream impairments identified by the EPA, and (3) relied upon unsupported scientific assumptions in contravention of Pennsylvania law."

Mr. Hawk noted that the Township is footing the bill for the entire project. Mr. Wolfe explained that there are four of these fights being fought in Pennsylvania. He noted that locally, the Township is paying the bill, and the Harrisburg Builders' Association is paying some of the bill, and Susquehanna Township is being billed, although they haven't paid anything, and Mr. Stine stated that the Harrisburg Authority is an intervener so they are paying someone to do something. Mr. Stine noted that they are not represented by Mr. Hall officially, noting that they are using Paul Bruner.

Mr. Blain questioned what the long term consequences would be if the Township did nothing. Mr. Stine noted that the Township would not be able to do anymore development since the Township would be exceeding its TDML levels. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Hall further states, "To our knowledge, the TDML requirements are among the most restrictive ever established in the country and, to a certainty, are impossible to attain. The TDMLs employed unprecedented approaches that were contrary to DEP's published methods for evaluating nutrients impacts. If these TDMLs are not modified, the environment will not be protected and the public fisc will be grossly misallocated as local expenditures well in excess of \$200 million would be required. All growth in Paxton, Goose and Indian Creek watersheds will cease because the EPAs proposed non-point source reductions are physically unattainable." He noted that this would be the ultimate result.

Mr. Hornung suggested that there should be a meeting of all the parties to this issue and a request of a commitment should be made to them, otherwise, the Township should discontinue its financial support. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Harrisburg Builders' Association has convened those meetings, and the meetings have been attended by staff and other interested parties. He noted that it has now come to the point that a meeting needs to be held at the Board level, Supervisors and Commissioners meeting with Authority members from the City. Mr. Blain noted that the City of Harrisburg does not care. Mr. Stine noted that the City of Harrisburg has nothing new to develop. Mr. Blain noted that Susquehanna Township has developable land but they may not care. Mr. Hornung noted, if the City of Harrisburg does not have developable land, they will still have to meet the standards or be fined. He noted that the City of Harrisburg would still have to spend \$200 million dollars to clean it up. Mr. Blain noted, if no one wants to participate, the Township needs to move forward, noting that spending \$165,000 is spending a lot less than millions of dollars based on what is mandated upon the Township. He noted that it would be nice if the other Townships and Authorities paid their fair share.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would be happy to schedule a meeting with some of the Commissioners from Susquehanna Township to meet with the Board members to discuss the issue.

Mr. Seeds suggested that Mr. Hall alluded that there may be a resolution by July. Mr. Wolfe noted, if the peer review is issued in the Township's favor, that it could be resolved in a short time. Mr. Seeds suggested that from what he read, it looks good for the Townships. He noted that he would not want to back out now, but he agreed that the others need to pay their fair share.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he brought it to the Board's attention, but he did not think that the Board would want to pull out at this time. Mr. Seeds questioned how much the Township should continue to pay for this issue. Mr. Hawk noted that he agreed that the Township should not pull out at this time; however, they should not be footing the bill for everyone else too.

Mr. Wolfe noted that no formal agreement was signed for this project, and he did not know how the billing was divided. Mr. Hornung noted that the Township needs a formal agreement. Mr. Hawk agreed that there should be a formal agreement for the payments of the legal action, noting that the Township may have to impose a tax increase to pay the bills.

Review of the mission statement, goals, and objectives
proposed by the Public Safety Committee

Mr. Wolfe explained that he had some issues with the goals and objectives for the Public Safety committee. He noted that they listed a review for waivers of building codes as an objective. He noted that there is no such thing. Mr. Stine noted that the only body that can grant a waiver is the appeals board. He noted that the Public Safety Committee does not have the authority and there are no waivers for the building codes. Mr. Crissman suggested deleting the objective.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Committee listed that they want to create a model fire suppression ordinance. He noted that they cannot do that. He noted that the Committee wants to review cases where the fire companies cannot agree on call box assignments. He noted that the Township has not had any problems with the fire companies and call boxes lately, but when they do occur, he did not think the Public Safety Committee would be equipped to handle the issue. He noted that those situations can become vicious and nasty. Mr. Seeds noted that the fire chiefs should handle the call box assignments. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Committee wants to review and approve assignment of primary response territories for fire and emergency medical associations. He noted that that would be up to the Board of Supervisors to decide, although the Board could delegate this responsibility. Mr. Seeds suggested that the Committee should go back to their mission statement where they state that they will advise the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Stine questioned what a truss marking ordinance is. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Committee wants to adopt an ordinance that would identify the type of building truss in a building by placing a marker on the outside of the building so they would know what they are up against in a fire situation.

Mr. Seeds questioned why the Committee would be reviewing and making recommendations regarding the Township's General Fund Capital Plan. He noted that he could understand the Fire Equipment Capital Fund, but not the General Fund. Mr. Wolfe noted that he did not understand this either. Mr. Seeds noted that that is not their business. Mr. Wolfe noted that he could respond noting that changes need to be made, or he could make the changes for the Board's adoption. Mr. Crissman suggested that someone needs to help the Committee write their goals and objectives.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the Committee would review each fire companies operating budget. He suggested that that could get ugly. Mr. Wolfe suggested that the Board should meet

again with the Committee to further discuss this. He noted that they wrote these objectives and goals without his assistance.

Mr. Hornung noted that he had no problem with the mission statement, but the goals are outside the mission statement. Mr. Seeds suggested that Mr. Wolfe could write the goals and objectives for the Committee. Mr. Crissman suggested that Mr. Wolfe should put a draft document together for the Committee.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the PAUCC may have a fire suppression requirement for single-family residences as soon as 2011 for new construction. Mr. Wolfe noted that he told the Committee that they do not have the authority to develop a model fire suppression ordinance. Mr. Stine noted that any ordinance like that would have to be approved by Labor and Industry and they will not do it since it would be different from what is in the current building code. He noted that there is a requirement in that there must be a substantively different condition in the municipality to justify it in the Township's area as opposed to anywhere else.

Mr. Seeds noted, if the building code would address residential homes, how would it handle people who have wells. He questioned if they would be forced to add tanks to store water. Mr. Wolfe noted that he has not seen the language yet. Mr. Hornung suggested that they would make the owners install water storage tanks.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the UCC Commission, in taking their actions, has overruled the recommendations from the State-wide Builders Association. He noted that the Builders Association rarely loses in issues like this.

Mr. Seeds suggested that this would be a mess with children setting off the sprinklers. Mr. Blain noted that many times smoke alarms are triggered by smoke from the stove. Mr. Stine noted that the sprinklers would be heat activated. He noted that something would have to melt the sensor to set it off, and they would be controlled individually, room-by-room.

Review of the Lower Paxton Township 2008 Annual Report

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Annual Report is required to be provided to the Board of Supervisors each year by the Township Manager in cooperation with the Department Heads.

Mr. Wolfe noted on page three, of the Executive Summary, it notes that the Township continues to implement the strategic plan, which includes the Linglestown Improvement Project, that should be bid in the next couple of months by PENNDOT. He noted that the Township was successful in lobbying PENNDOT for the Nyes Road Corridor project. Mr. Blain questioned if

the project would start in July. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mr. Blain questioned which phase would be worked first because, from Union Deposit Road to Red Top Road, the road is staked off. Mr. Wolfe explained that the project scope is from Gallop Road to Union Deposit Road, skipping the Union Deposit Road intersection, and from there to Red Top Road. He noted that it includes a traffic signal at Locust Lane, and he explained that the Township only had to pay for the engineering of that traffic signal in the amount of \$26,000.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township continued its participation in the Capital Region Insurance Trust for health care benefits. He explained that the Township was a founding member of that trust, noting that health care costs have increased by 7% over the past few years. He noted that the Township received a return of \$320,000, and the 2008 payment to be received in 2009 is approximately \$360,000.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Audit Committee was very successful in directing the Township to leave the Capital Tax Collection Bureau and retain Berkheimer Tax Administrator for the Earned Income Tax and Local Service Tax collections. He noted that the Audit Committee would be meeting with Berkheimer, for an update, in the near future.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township completed bargaining with the Police Collective Bargaining Unit, and retained a 4-year contract with a 3% increase in salaries for each year.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township has continued a host of issues including participation in the Paxton Creek Watershed Organization. He noted that Mr. Buskirk dropped off a letter requesting assistance from the Township for a grant that the Paxton Creek Watershed Organization is writing. He noted, if the Board has no issues, he would write a letter of support on their behalf.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township is involved in a legal fight concerning the Paxton Creek TMDLs, and this was explained previously in the meeting.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township has participated in the Capital Region Council of Governments battle against the Chesapeake Bay Tributary Study, as well as negotiating a Verizon Cable franchise agreement.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township ended the 2008 Year with a General Fund deficit of \$2,649,985.00. He noted that \$1,825,000 was a transfer to the General Improvement Fund; therefore, the true deficit was only \$824,958. He noted that when he prepared the budget, staff estimated the deficit at \$865,000. He noted that there was an increase in real estate tax rates from 7 mills to .87 mills. He noted that at the end of 2008, the General Fund balance was \$6,998,682.

Mr. Wolfe noted that 2008 was a difficult year to end out and audit, due to the change in Finance Directors. He noted that Donna Speakman was the Finance Director for three quarters of the year, and Tim Houck took over the operations for the last quarter of the year. He explained that the Audit Committee is to review the Audit drafts next week, noting that additional changes have been made. He noted that the actual General Fund balance for 2008 was \$7,112,122.00.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township continued the implementation of the Fire Equipment Capital Plan. He noted that the Friendship Center (FC) ended the year with a deficit of \$92,000, noting that the previous year's deficit was \$130,000. He noted that several things were done to reduce operating cost losses on investments of 26%.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Community Development Department continues to enforce the Uniform Construction Code (UCC), and it has just completed the revisions to the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO). He noted that the land development activities are at low rates that the Township has not experienced before.

Mr. Wolfe noted that a new contract was negotiated with Waste Management effective July 2, 2008 through to 2013. He noted that the Township eliminated the Public Works Department's Leaf Waste Program which is now offered by Waste Management.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Parks and Recreation Department oversees roughly 378 acres of parkland. He noted that roughly 17,000 people participated in programs, and coordinated more than 30 sports organizations. He noted that the construction of the Thomas B. George Jr. Park continued, with most of the work finishing in 2009, except for the Skate Park, which the Freedom Group is overseeing. He noted that the Happy Tails Dog Park was completed. He noted that staff spent much time with the Capital Areas Soccer Association (CASA) in regards to the Wolfersberger Tract development, although no final conclusion resulted. He noted that the Greenway Committee prepared a Greenway Plan that was adopted as an amendment to the Township's Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Wolfe noted, for the Friendship Center, at the end of the year, there was a little less than 2,300 memberships representing over 5,000 individuals. He noted that 640 programs were held that served 8,542 seniors.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Police Department continued with the implementation of the Vision 2006 Strategic Plan, noting that the Board did not authorize a full complement of 62 police officers. He noted that the Department is now reevaluating the plan, and could potentially reduce the number more. He noted that there were 35 participants in the Juvenile Alternative

Sentencing Program (JASP), which doubled the participants from the previous year. He noted that this program started as a Federal program that the Board took over after funding ceased.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Public Works Department ended the curbside leaf waste program, and made significant changes to the leaf waste compost site. He noted that Mr. Robbins needs to be complimented on how the site functions and looks today. He noted that only .6 of a mile was reconstructed in 2008, but much overlay work was done in conjunction with the sanitary sewer mini-basin projects. He noted that the Township maintains 35 traffic signals, and mans an I&I crew internally, between the Public Works and Sewer Departments.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Sewer Department is working to implement the corrective action plan for Beaver Creek and Paxton Creek in accordance with the second consent decree, however, the Township is still waiting for DEP to sign the amendment. He noted that the Beaver Creek Corrective Action Plan, providing for a wet weather treatment plant, is in significant litigation with South Hanover Township, and the Authority is working to implement the Paxton Creek Corrective Action Plan. He explained that the contracts that were under management by the Sewer Department last year included Earl Drive, Valley Road and Winfield Street, Lakewood Hills Project, Beaver Creek Pump Station, replacement of the Linglestown Road Force Main, and a minor list of other jobs.

Mr. Wolfe noted that each individual Department provided a very detailed analysis of what they did in the past year. Mr. Wolfe noted that he did not have the Department heads come to the meeting as the Board has met in workshop sessions with most Department Heads during this first quarter of 2009. Mr. Blain agreed that it was not necessary to meet with the Department Heads to review the Annual Report.

Review of the Key Indicator Report for year-end 2008
and the first quarter 2009

Mr. Wolfe explained that he would like to discuss the Key Indicator Report (KIR) for the year-end 2008 in conjunction with the first quarter 2009. He noted that he has some quick flags to review with the Board members.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the actual debit for Operations was \$824,958.00, with Staff's budget estimate at \$846,448.00.

Mr. Wolfe noted page two of the 2008 KIR lists the current financial standing at the end of the year for 2008 as follows: the General Fund balance listed at \$6.9 million, but was actually

\$7.1 million. He noted that the General Improvement Fund for Capital projects was \$2.2 million; \$1.8 million was a transfer from the General Fund. He noted that the Fire Equipment Capital Fund started with \$1 million and ended the year with \$522,275, with those funds being spent in 2009. He noted that the FC had a loss of \$92,000 which is one-third less than what it was previously, and the FC Capital Fund is \$327,000. He noted that the Authority had a deficit of \$1.8 million with \$12.5 million in revenues and expenditures of \$14.3 million. He noted that the capital projects are being booked in the operations as opposed to the capital funds since it was not an identified fund in accordance with the bonds that were issued. He noted that there was \$21 million on account. He noted that the Pension funds have losses of 25%.

Mr. Wolfe noted page four, third paragraph, lists the General Fund balance, and staff is very concerned with the balance. He noted that the General Fund balance, over a fifteen year period grew to \$8.5 million, however, at its peak, it grew to \$10,289,502. He noted, now, the fund is \$7.1 million. He explained that 85% of the draw has been for capital projects, although, the 2008 year finished with a deficit. He noted that a portion of those funds were budgeted to make it through 2009 as part of its budget.

Mr. Wolfe noted that page seven lists the General Fund revenues. He noted that for 2008, Real Estate Taxes were 26% higher than in 2007 which was due to the tax increase. He noted that the Earned Income Tax (EIT) was 3% higher than 2007. He suggested that the EIT will be lower this year. He noted that the Local Services Tax (LST) was 26% lower than last year due to the implementation of the new State Law. He noted that the Real Estate Transfer Tax was 19% lower than 2007, due to the economic conditions. He noted that the Township needs to watch these numbers in 2009 as they make up more than half of the operating revenues. Mr. Seeds suggested that the LST is only low at this time of the year since the Township would receive the complete funds at the end of the year. Mr. Wolfe answered that it was not true, since there are many more exceptions now that would lower the amount received by the Township. Mr. Hornung suggested that many people get away with not paying this tax.

Mr. Hornung noted, on page six of the 1st Quarter KIR, Real Estate Tax is down 10%, EIT is down 11%, LST is 132% higher, and Real Estate Transfer Tax is down 16%. He noted that this is the comparison of the actual 2008 numbers to 2009. Mr. Seeds questioned why the Real Estate Tax was down. Mr. Wolfe answered that people are not paying their taxes. Mr. Blain suggested that many people are not paying during the discount period. Mr. Seeds suggested that the Real Estate taxes would not be down 10% at the end of the year, as it would amount to a lot

of money. Mr. Blain noted that he is more concerned with the EIT, which is directly related to jobs. He noted that many people are taking pay cuts. Mr. Wolfe suggested that some of the decrease could be a result of the transition to the new tax collector, Berkheimer. He noted that Ms. McConnell from the Central Dauphin School District is booking her loss in revenues at 3%. Mr. Seeds suggested that the Harrisburg area is pretty stable for jobs. Mr. Blain noted that unemployment is up, with less people working, and many people have taken pay reductions. He noted that it would pick up since CTCB is spinning confusion telling the people that they could still file with CTCB who would then transfer the money to Berkheimer. He noted that that is not accurate, and they should not be doing that.

Mr. Wolfe noted that page seven shows that Community Development revenues are 54% lower as compared to 2008. He noted that the home building industry is in a real slump. Mr. Hawk questioned how many developments are active at this time. Mr. Wolfe answered none, and reported that the Township has not seen a new plan in over a year.

Mr. Wolfe noted page nine shows that the Fire Capital Equipment Plan had a balance of \$522,275, with revenues of \$260,521. He noted in April of 2008, the third piece of apparatus was purchased at \$494,681, leaving a balance of \$189,000. Mr. Wolfe noted that there is anticipated revenue from the sale of an engine in 2009.

Mr. Wolfe noted page eleven shows that the General Improvement Fund spent \$183,000 last year for capital stormwater management projects; however, so far this year, little has been spent. He noted that staff spent a few funds on the SALDO, noting that the Ordinances would be re-codified after the SALDO is completed. He noted that some woodland restoration was completed in Brightbill Park in the first quarter of this year, and \$38,000 was spent for bridge improvements. He noted that the Linglestown Road project is going to bid soon, and for the Linglestown Alleys and Parking, Mr. Stine is working on an ordinance to accept Blackberry Alley this year and to pave it, while a decision needs to be made for Raspberry Alley. He noted that HRG, Inc. is reviewing a proposal from Mr. Tim Archibald for a satellite parking area behind the Roasters. Mr. Seeds questioned if the \$250,000 would include paving Archibald's parking lot. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is a budget number only, to be used for what the Board chooses to do.

Mr. Hornung suggested that Blackberry Alley should be one-way in the opposite direction of the one-lane traffic on Linglestown Road during construction. He noted that the alley is not wide enough for two-way traffic, and the construction would elevate the amount of traffic

during construction. Mr. Wolfe noted for Raspberry Alley, the discussion for paving has only included the area up to the Flower store, as the Township does not have right-of-way to the Fire Company. Mr. Hornung noted that the Flower Shop does not want all the traffic to drive through its parking lot.

Mr. Wolfe noted that George Park construction is only starting at this time, and the Township spent a good deal of money on machinery at the compost facility last year. He noted that it is hoped that a 90% reimbursement grant will be granted by DEP to the Township as part of the 902 Grant Program.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Sewer Authority has a few large projects to be bid later this year. He noted that Mike Bova would be in attendance at the May Authority meeting. He explained that Mr. Wendle created a payout analysis for the next three years, and Mr. Bova would provide funding options based on the draw down schedule. He noted that the Authority could be in a position where it may need to issue bonds this year.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would like to begin the 2010 budget projections as soon as Mr. Houck has the April numbers completed. He explained that he wants to prepare a year-end estimate, noting that the budget is tight, and there may be a need to tighten it further as the year progresses. He stated that he would review where the Township is, financially, through the rest of 2009, and prepare a buildout for 2010 to see what the Township is looking at. He noted that he would like to have a report for the Board to review in June.

Mr. Blain noted that the Township needs to monitor the cash flow now. He stated that the Board has done a good job of managing expenses, noting that the expenses are less for the first three months of this year as compared to last year's. He noted that the Township is down \$40,000, but the revenues are also down, and he is concerned that he does not see it getting any better. He explained that the Township is planning to spend \$550,000 for asphalt, \$200,000 on equipment, and the FC year-to-date net income is lower. Mr. Wolfe noted that the FC, at the end of March, reached the 2,500 memberships mark for the first time in three years. He noted that the memberships are at an all time three-year high, however, the FC is experiencing the conversion of the seniors from the traditional way of paying for services. He noted that most paid a lump sum on an annual basis in the past; however, many are now paying through the Health Wise program at \$30 per month. He noted that most of the income is monthly based instead on a lump sum annual base. He noted that it provides for a cash flow issue, but not less money, overall. He

noted that the FC receives more from those who have memberships through the medical program, only it is stretched out over a 12 month payment period.

Mr. Blain noted that the Township has nine months left in the 2009 budget, and it appears that the numbers will be below budget, therefore, he would recommend that the Department Heads cut their current budgets. Mr. Wolfe noted that when the budgets are prepared for the next year, internally, the first step that staff must take is an estimate of year-end results. He noted that they must complete this prior to starting the next year's budget. He noted that he would work with staff to complete this process before the end of June.

Mr. Wolfe noted that more significant steps may be needed to get through the 2009 year.

Mr. Blain noted that the biggest item of concern would be revenues for 2009, noting that expenses are relatively consistent, and it could provide the possible deficit. He noted that it would be good to hold a discussion regarding what items could be cut or deferred to another year. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Police Department is approved for a complement of 61 police officers, and the Department is currently at 57 police officers since Sgt. Anderson and Chief Bair retired, another officer was removed from service, and another officer died. He noted that he may only replace enough personnel to resume a manpower of 58 police officers, plus one for the drug task force. He noted that it would be two less than the approved complement, and that would be an additional savings.

Mr. Hornung noted that the \$1.7 million is an estimate of deficit for the first quarter, and he questioned if nothing was changed, would this continue for each additional quarter. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township always has a deficit situation in the first quarter. He noted that there is very little real estate tax received in the first quarter, and by the end of the second quarter, there is a significant surplus. He noted that the Township could look at rolling layoffs as a potential in non-safety public areas. He noted that the paving program could be cut and used for wage and benefit costs. He explained that a certain amount of funds are budgeted to come out of the General Fund for capital projects. He noted that the Township would be doing a bond issue this year for sewer, and instead of taking General Fund savings, the Township could borrow more for capital projects. He noted that there would be no additional costs for borrowing, since the Authority would be doing it anyway. He explained that there are options, but a decision should be made soon.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township is eligible for \$185,200 in stimulus funds for energy conservation efforts that would be available in 2009 and 2010. He noted that no projects are

budgeted at this time, but that money could be used to perform enhancements on facilities that could reduce the operating costs at the FC and Municipal Center.

Mr. Wolfe reported that PENNDOT continues to schedule the following work for the Township this year: Nyes Road, Linglestown Road project, a traffic signal at I-83 ramp at the Colonial Road exit, and he received the plans for repaving Route 22 from Colonial Road to Old Jonestown Road in West Hanover Township. He noted that a lot of work would be done with a tight budget.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he has a fear that as the Township approaches the end of 2009, it would not be where it budgeted financially. Mr. Blain explained that that is the key, however, if there is a significant deficit, then the Board may have to raise taxes, and he would like to say that the Board took emergency action back in June when it identified the problem to try to reduce cost saving efforts to reduce a deficit.

Mr. Wolfe noted if the Township is looking at these numbers, imagine what the surrounding municipalities are looking at. Mr. Stine noted that many of the municipalities are not looking at the numbers, and will only find the deficits in October. He noted that many other municipalities do not issue Key Indicator Reports. Mr. Wolfe noted that the State may end up with many distressed communities at the end of the year.

Mr. Wolfe noted that most municipalities are experiencing 25% plus losses in pension funds and the Township is starting actuarial evaluations on those losses. He noted that there is no additional State aid to make up the losses; therefore, it becomes a municipal responsibility. Mr. Blain noted for many private companies the debt difference is coming from the equity of the company. He noted that the Township would have to fund those losses. He noted that the good news is that the market was up in April, and that the actuarial evaluation would be done in 2009 based upon the standing at 12/31/08. He noted that the Township would be required to fund where the Township was as of 2008, beginning September of this year.

“Otta Know” Presentation
Decertification of Multisonic traffic signal controllers

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Multisonic Traffic Signal controllers are no longer approved by PENNDOT because the manufacturer is going out of business. He noted that PENNDOT provided a list to the Township of equipment that would no longer be acceptable for installation.

He noted that the equipment that the Township owns at all 35 intersections could be found on that list.

Mr. Wolfe noted, over a period of time, the traffic signal controllers would have to be changed at roughly \$5,000 per intersection. Mr. Hornung questioned if the parts could be kept to repair the old units until the new signal controllers are converted. Mr. Wolfe answered that Mr. Robbins is doing that now, in order to delay some of the conversions. He noted that he hopes to find some type of financial assistance to fund this project, given the fact that PENNDOT does not permit the Multisonic traffic controllers as acceptable equipment.

The Pennsylvania Right-to-Know Law as it is being applied to e-mail

Mr. Stine noted that his news revolves around the Office of Open Records, and the many decisions that have been made from appeals made to their office. He noted that he provided copies of three decisions, two decisions concerning appeals by James L. Mollick, MD, and one from John E. Bowders. He noted that the Office of Open Records has issued a decision that states that emails between members of the governing body and citizens are now public records. He noted that the municipality has the duty to retain those records, and respond to Right-To-Know requests. He noted that it has been suggested that the governing body purchase lap top computers for each member of the governing body and they should be used only for municipal business. He explained, because the computers are owned by the Township, the Township would be retaining the records. He noted, if requests for records were made, then they could be downloaded from those computers or be available for public inspection.

Mr. Seeds noted if he would email Mr. Crissman in regards to agency business, would that be a public record. Mr. Stine answered yes. Mr. Seeds questioned if a citizen emails him with a complaint, is that also a public record. Mr. Stine answered yes.

Mr. Hornung questioned if he sent Mr. Wolfe an email regarding agency business, that Mr. Wolfe could save the email. Mr. Wolfe noted that if he was copied, he could retain the emails on the Township server. He noted if someone makes a request, he must provide the record. Mr. Hornung noted if someone emails him regarding a problem, he could forward it to Mr. Wolfe.

Mr. Stine explained, in the Mollick case, the Township had to go into the personal computers of the governing body to pull off those emails. He noted that one ruling concerned a

person who emailed from his company office, stating that the governing body did not have to access the company computer to retrieve the records.

Mr. Stine explained that the Office of Open Records has only been making decisions since January, and this is only the tip of the iceberg. Mr. Seeds noted that they could access Mr. Stine's computer. Mr. Stine answered that his emails are privileged communications. Mr. Hawk questioned if the Board members emails could be copied to Mr. Stine. Mr. Stine noted that that is what happened in one of those decisions and the Office of Open Records stated that they could not do that as it would not be covered under attorney-client privileges.

Mr. Stine noted that Dr. Mollick has filed numerous requests and resulting appeals to the Office of Open Records. Mr. Wolfe noted if the Township had an issue with someone like that, it could conceivably dedicate one staff member to retrieving documents in order to address the new law.

Mr. Stine noted that it has been determined that volunteer fire companies are subject to the Right-To-Know law as well.

IMPROVEMENT GUARANTEES

Mr. Hawk noted that there were two Improvement Guarantees.

Candlewood Suites

An extension in a letter of credit, with Mid Penn Bank, in the amount of \$117,100.00, with an expiration date of May 12, 2010.

Country Inn and Suites

A reduction in a letter of credit, with Orrstown Bank, in the amount of \$5,522.00, with an expiration date of October 16, 2009.

Mr. Seeds questioned why Candlewood Suites was presented again since it was approved for a reduction last month. Ms. Heberle noted that she would have Ms. Wissler contact him with an answer.

Mr. Blain made a motion to approve the two listed Improvement Guarantees as presented. Mr. Crissman seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous voice vote followed.

Mr. Crissman questioned what Mr. Buskirk was looking for in a letter from the Board members regarding the Susquehanna Watershed's grant application. Mr. Wolfe noted that he was not sure what he was looking for.

Mr. Crissman questioned what the EMS uses in their database for their calls to the Township. He noted that he overheard a conversation of a woman who was injured and lives in Kendale Oaks. She was complaining that the EMS could not find her address, and this delayed the response time. Mr. Wolfe answered that the EMS uses the Dauphin County 911 CAD system. Mr. Crissman noted that the EMS had to call the Police to find the address.

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 9:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman
Township Secretary