

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Board Meeting held June 9, 2009

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

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

Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steve Stine, Township Solicitor; Lori Wissler, Community Development Manager; Stephen Fleming, HRG, Inc.; Acting Chief David Johnson; Watson Fisher and Ted Robertson, SWAN; Bill Bostic, Linglestown Gazette; Rev. George Reynolds and Ron Estep, Linglestown Life United Methodist Church; Christopher Beauregard, CEDG Engineers, and Greg Doyle, Carmen Court.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Public Comment

No public comment was provided.

Discussion with Linglestown Life United Methodist Church regarding
waivers requested as part of a proposed land development plan

Ms. Wissler explained that Rev. George Reynolds, Christopher Beauregard, and Ron Estep are present to discuss the plan. She noted that an additional waiver, for road widening for minor street width improvements and dedication of right-of-way, that pertains to Blackberry Alley, has been requested by the church. She noted that the plan would be presented to the Board for their approval in the near future and the applicant wanted to discuss some issues with the Board prior to that meeting. She noted that the applicant also wanted to discuss how their improvements would tie into the Linglestown Square Improvement project.

Mr. Beauregard explained that he is the engineer for the plan for the Linglestown Life United Methodist Church. He distributed additional exhibits to the Board members and staff.

Mr. Beauregard explained that the church is requesting three waivers. He noted that the first waiver is for the requirement to submit a preliminary plan, noting that there are no major public improvements or road or stormwater improvements.

Mr. Beauregard explained that the second and additional waiver request was brought to his attention during a staff meeting. He noted that the project site abuts Blackberry Alley that runs along the south side of the church property. He noted that it is an unimproved road, with a gravel road surface and is 18 feet at its widest length. He noted that Blackberry Alley runs in front of the new parking area constructed by the Township, and is located within three feet of the road, therefore, it would not allow for the widening of Blackberry Alley.

Mr. Beauregard explained that the third waiver is from the requirement to provide a traffic study. He noted that the improvements would be constructed concurrently with the State road project for the Linglestown Square Improvements. He noted that he would like to be able to piggyback on those road improvements related to the traffic study. He noted that the Township Ordinance requires, for every increase over 100 trips per day, a traffic study. He explained that the Church is over that limit.

Mr. Beauregard noted, that in discussions held with the staff, that the Linglestown Square Improvements should tie in and flow with the church's improvements. He noted that the first exhibit that he provided showed the edge of the new roadway on North Mountain Road that would eliminate the grass strip and trees to the west, and pave the road to the current sidewalk. He noted that the new sidewalk would be located in the same footprint as the current sidewalk and terminate at the edge of Blackberry Alley. He explained that the Church has been asked to extend the sidewalk from the church to Blackberry Alley to provide pedestrian access to the Square from the church property. He noted that the exhibit shows sidewalk from Blackberry Alley to the church along the existing edge of Mountain Road. He noted that the second exhibit shows the intersection looking south towards the Square with the proposed new sidewalk, pedestrian sidewalk, stop sign and stop bar. He noted that the last two exhibits shows Phase I for the Linglestown Life United Methodist Church improvements, and the ultimate buildout.

Ms. Hawk noted that Mr. Beauregard is requesting to piggyback on the Arora Associates Traffic Study conducted for PENNDOT in conjunction with the road improvements. Mr. Beauregard answered yes. Mr. Hawk questioned if Mr. Beauregard felt that the Arora Associates Traffic Study would have a good take on what impact the church traffic would provide for the

intersections. Mr. Beauregard noted that the increase in traffic is larger than 100 trips per day, but it generally occurs on a Sunday morning, during non-peak hours.

Mr. Crissman questioned what staff's opinion was for the waiver of the traffic study. Mr. Fleming answered that he would support the waiver; however, he requested to have the opportunity to check if the PENNDOT Traffic Study has already incorporated the traffic from the church. He noted that, typically, Sunday morning traffic would not require road improvements, especially improvements that have been recently studied. Mr. Beauregard noted that he did not have a copy of the Traffic Study and would be willing to review it with HRG, Inc., but he would have to secure a copy of it from Mr. Case of Arora and Associates.

Mr. Crissman requested staff to resolve the issue, showing staff's support, prior to the plan's request for approval during a Board meeting. Mr. Fleming responded that he would work with the church.

Mr. Hawk questioned what staff's opinion was for the road widening waiver. Mr. Fleming answered that it speaks to the existing constraints along Blackberry Alley. He noted that given the limited traffic and significant costs to improve the alley he did not believe that the alley should be approved to a full street design requirement. Mr. Fleming noted that a gravel lane is not desirable for a public thoroughfare, noting that it would be better to improve the alley in a more permanent fashion. He noted that it is unknown if there are plans to make improvements from the church property to Blue Mountain Parkway for Blackberry Alley, and at this time, a waiver would be appropriate.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the church could make a donation toward the paving of Blackberry Alley which would be necessary prior to the start of construction for the Linglestown Road improvements. He noted that although PENNDOT has established a defined detour for the project, many local residents would be using the alleys for access, as well as the customers for the local businesses. He explained that the Township would have to make improvements to Blackberry Alley, noting that when the traffic pattern for Linglestown Road is open, eastbound only, Blackberry Alley would be one-way west, and reverse, when the traffic patterns change. He questioned, since the church would not have to provide a traffic study, if it would consider providing a donation towards improvements for Blackberry Alley. Mr. Beauregard noted that he would have to speak to the client regarding this request. Mr. Hornung suggested than a donation of \$5,000 to \$10,000 would be a suggestion. Pastor Reynolds noted that he would ask his congregation to look at that option. Mr. Hornung explained that there are no Federal funds

budgeted to improve Blackberry Alley, and the Township would have to incur all those costs. Mr. Hawk noted that any help to defray the costs would be appreciated.

Pastor Reynolds noted that the church would be helping the project by working with United Water PA to bring public water to its location. Mr. Hornung noted that it would be an expensive proposition. Mr. Beauregard noted that a waterline is shown on the Arora plan. He noted that United Water PA has indicated that it would provide water to the church but the exact route has not been determined.

Mr. Wolfe noted if water is not installed as part of the project, and brought to the church by way of Blackberry Alley, it would cause a construction issue. Pastor Reynolds noted that United Water PA's recommendation is to bring water up Mountain Road. Mr. Wolfe noted that there has been no commitment from United Water PA to install a waterline as part of the project. Mr. Beauregard noted that they have made a commitment to the church, but the exact route has not been determined.

Mr. Seeds noted that the church would be required to install a sprinkler system, and it would be very costly without public water access.

Mr. Wolfe explained that the Linglestown Square project was bid today by PENNDOT, and does not include a waterline at this point. Pastor Reynolds noted that he understood that it did not have to be included at this point. Mr. Wolfe answered yes, but he noted that he has not received any commitment from United Water PA that they plan to install the waterline. He noted that he was told that if it is not included in the project, then the church would have to run its waterline in Blackberry Alley and this could become an issue for access to the businesses and properties during construction.

Pastor Reynolds explained that he is waiting for a determination from United Water PA, as they are waiting for an answer from their parent company. He noted that he would like to be able to install the waterline in the alley, if needed, prior to the road improvements proposed by the Township.

Mr. Hawk questioned when the church would like to start construction, and when does the church expect an answer from United Water PA. Pastor Reynolds answered that he has been in constant contact with United Water PA, and it was their intention to move ahead with the construction of a waterline in Linglestown Road, pending a final review of information by their parent company. Mr. Wolfe suggested that the delay is the result of a money issue. Mr. Stine suggested that the Linglestown Project does not have enough people who are willing to connect.

Pastor Reynolds suggested that, from a local perspective, United Water PA would like to see the project move ahead; however, the parent company makes the decision.

Mr. Seeds noted that HRG, Inc. provided 29 comments for the plan. Mr. Beauregard explained that he and staff reviewed those comments during a meeting held last Thursday and resolved most of the comments, with the exception of the waiver requests. Ms. Wissler agreed. Mr. Crissman explained that he would want an assurance during the business meeting that the comments have or would be resolved. Mr. Beauregard explained that as a result of discussions held during this meeting, changes will be made to the plan.

Mr. Seeds noted that the church is not asking for a waiver for sidewalks and curbing, but he questioned if they must only put new sidewalks and curbs along one side of Mountain Road. Ms. Wissler answered yes. Mr. Seeds noted that they already have sidewalk installed in the area, therefore, they do not need a waiver. Mr. Beauregard noted that there is an existing sidewalk however, over the years it has had asphalt placed over it, so the plan is to install new sidewalk and curb which will line up along with the new sidewalk and curb for the Linglestown Project. He noted that he would have to add a pedestrian crosswalk at the intersection at Blackberry Alley. Mr. Seeds noted that the big issue for the church would be the installation of a waterline.

Mr. Crissman questioned if there are any outstanding issues from the HRG, Inc. memo. Mr. Beauregard answered no. Mr. Crissman noted that he must work all the comments out with staff and HRG, Inc. Mr. Beauregard noted that that is the reason why he met with staff last Thursday and for this meeting tonight. Ms. Wissler noted that Mr. Beauregard did not want to resubmit the revised plan until after the workshop meeting with the Board.

Ms. Wissler noted that Mr. Beauregard would secure a copy of the Traffic Study from Arora and Associates and review it with staff.

Mr. Hawk noted that it is important to get United Water PA to make the waterline part of the construction project. He suggested that more residents may sign up to connect if they see it is being installed.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the church would be using part of the existing parking lot to the north of the church. Mr. Beauregard answered yes. Mr. Seeds questioned if more parking would be added to that area. Mr. Beauregard answered that he would be adding parking beyond that area to satisfy the zoning ordinance. He noted that part of the existing parking area would be maintained, and the grade would be identical to what it is currently, with a new surface and striping. He noted, beyond that, there would be a terrace system, where the parking comes out

and enters into a grass area, and another parking area. He noted that additional parking would be added as the church grows. Mr. Beauregard noted that the last two exhibits in the packet show the increase parking locations. Mr. Seeds questioned if the church could use the satellite parking area to count as parking. Mr. Beauregard answered that the required parking is based on parking north of the church, not south of the church. He suggested that the satellite parking area may be used during Easter and Christmas, but since the parking is so far away from the main entrance and it involves steps, it would not be used on regular Sundays.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the purpose of the expansion is growth in membership. Pastor Reynolds answered yes.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the daycare would grow also. Mr. Estep noted that it is possible. Mr. Seeds questioned if the reason for the addition was to support the daycare. Mr. Estep noted that the 9:30 Praise and Worship Service has grown.

Mr. Beauregard questioned if the Board has any need to discuss his response to HRG's 20 comments. Mr. Hawk noted that he would be satisfied if those comments are worked out with staff.

Review of the final draft of the proposed Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance

Ms. Wissler noted Mr. Fleming would provide some information as to what was added or changed from the first draft that the Board member's received.

Mr. Fleming noted that the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO) has been updated from the last time the Board reviewed it, to include a proposal for a Traffic Calming ordinance as well as a Recreation ordinance.

Mr. Fleming noted that the Traffic Calming ordinance will encourage the design of the streets and roadside appurtenances to be pedestrian friendly and aesthetically pleasing, and promote adherence to the speed limit within a development, and negate a need for future retrofits. He noted that traffic calming shall enhance the street and shall produce a roadway network that naturally disperses and slows traffic. He noted that traffic calming should be implemented in a comprehensive approach utilizing both non-evasive and evasive techniques as differencing situations would apply. He explained that non-evasive traffic calming, such as traffic calming through geometric design elements, shall be considered first, where appropriate, and evasive traffic calming shall be applied where dictated by the ordinance.

Mr. Fleming noted that the Township currently supports the use of traffic calming features in proposed developments, although the current ordinance with the street design

requirements conflicts with the geometric design of a traffic calming feature. He noted that a developer would have to apply for a waiver to use certain traffic calming features found in the current SALDO. He noted that the proposed ordinance would work well with the new street design requirements and PENNDOT's Traffic Calming Design Handbook to allow the incorporation of those elements and a seamless transition without a large list of waivers.

Mr. Crissman questioned if he expected that there would still be some waivers requested. Mr. Fleming answered that there may be some, but the intent is to reduce significantly the amount of waivers requested with respect to street design and incorporating traffic calming.

Mr. Fleming explained that staff chose to use PENNDOT's Traffic Calming Design Handbook instead of incorporating a large amount of requirements, noting that as changes are made to the Handbook they would automatically be included in the SALDO requirements.

Mr. Fleming noted that HRG, Inc. was retained by the Township to assist in revising the SALDO, noting that there were four goals to accomplish. The first goal was to assemble local SALDO's that were comprehensive and represented elements in order to draft the initial base of information. He noted that HRG, Inc was to attend initial planning meetings with Township Staff, Public Works, Zoning and Planning, Parks and Recreation Departments, and others in order to draft the specific sections of the Ordinance as they applied to their Departments. He noted that the third goal was to collaborate with staff to provide a draft SALDO for review and comment by the Board and Planning Commission, hold public hearings, and advertise the Ordinance, up to the adoption of the SALDO, and the fourth goal was to deliver an approved Ordinance that would meet the Board's approval.

Mr. Hawk requested Mr. Fleming to formalize his remarks for use as an introduction to a future Public Hearing.

Mr. Seeds questioned when the public hearing would be held. Ms. Wissler questioned if there was a need for additional meetings with the Planning Commission. Mr. Wolfe answered that there is no need unless the Board desires it. He noted that the SALDO could be advertised for a Public Hearing. Mr. Crissman questioned if there would be any objections with the Planning Commission to move ahead to the public hearing. Mr. Wolfe noted that the two groups held multiple meetings to discuss the SALDO but stopped around budget time. Mr. Crissman noted that if it is not necessary, then there is no need to have additional meetings.

Mr. Seeds noted that he reviewed the SALDO and he had a few questions. He questioned if the change was made for parking spaces with interior landscaping, from 12 to 20 parking

spaces. He noted that another issue regarded five-foot setbacks since it would not work in Linglestown due to the narrow lots. He noted another item is the 50-lot minimum on accepting land as dedication for parks. He noted that it should not be in effect when there is an opportunity to adjoin existing parkland. He noted that the Township should be provided the opportunity to take land if it could be attached to an existing park. He noted that the last item concerned agricultural zoning, where the Township was permitting some commercial uses. Mr. Wolfe noted that that would be a part of the zoning ordinance and not the SALDO.

Mr. Ted Robertson questioned, if from this point on, there would be no more input from outside parties concerning the SALDO. Mr. Hawk noted that there would be an opportunity to make comments during the public hearing. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Planning Commission would review the SALDO at its meeting, and again at the public hearing. He noted if SWAN had additional input in advance of those meetings, the Township would accept those comments.

Comments from Urban Research and Design (Charlie Schmehl) on the amendments to the Zoning Ordinance to accommodate the sale of condominiums

Mr. Hawk noted that he received an email from Mr. Epstein regarding this issue. Ms. Wissler distributed a copy of the letter that Mr. Epstein emailed to the Board members. Mr. Stine noted that Mr. Epstein misconstrued what Mr. Dobslaw was asking for. He noted that it had nothing to do with vertical stacking for condominium units. Mr. Hawk noted that he responded to Mr. Epstein explaining to him that it was more of an issue with the banks not loaning money for mortgages for condominiums based on the wording as a result of the Commonwealth Court's decision. Mr. Stine noted that it has more to do with the conversion of units into condominiums and whether or not it needs a subdivision plan to be filed. He noted that the vertical stacking issue is not part of this discussion

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Epstein requested the Board to postpone action until a legal definition of a lot and unit is determined through the appeal process. He suggested that it could take years for this to occur, and it would deny a small developer his livelihood. He noted that it does not affect anything other than the ability to provide loans for mortgages by the bank. Mr. Robertson noted that it did not affect the calculation of density or anything like that.

Ms. Wissler explained that this was the point of moving ahead quickly because the Township did not want to wait for a final court decision. She noted that Mr. Wolfe thought that Mr. Epstein may have confused this request with the Village of Laurel Ridge's request for flats.

Ms. Wissler noted that staff requested Mr. Schmehl of the Urban Research and Design Group to review Mr. Dobslaw's proposed revision, and generally, he is in agreement with everything. She noted, if this meets the Board approval, she would move ahead with the zoning amendment process.

Mr. Stine noted, if you look at the bottom of the page containing Mr. Schmehl's comments, Section 307, D, 2, he states that all the building improvements have to be laid out in a way that they would be able to meet all the dimensional requirements. Mr. Stine questioned if the buildings were far enough apart to meet the dimensional requirements. Ms. Wissler stated that the plan was looked at as one lot. Mr. Stine noted that Mr. Schmehl states the following: "the entire lot itself would have to meet all the requirements, the individual units would not, but the buildings and other improvements shall be physically laid out on the tract in such a way that they would be able to meet all of the dimensional requirements for density and coverage." Mr. Stine suggested that density and coverage are not necessarily important because it does not have to deal with the layout. He noted that it would need to meet the dimensional requirements that would have applied if non-condominium lots would be used. He noted that the question for that plan would be, are the buildings situated enough apart to meet those requirements. He noted if the plan does not meet those requirements, it still wouldn't be in conformance. Ms. Wissler stated that she would have to review the plan. Mr. Fleming noted that staff would need to review the plans as if you would be drawing a lot line in between the two buildings, and then apply the setbacks.

Mr. Hawk noted that it has nothing to do with the density.

Review of a proposed reorganization of Police Department manpower

Chief Johnson noted that he submitted a memo to Mr. Wolfe detailing some of the issues that the Department needs to address within the Police Department, specifically the over specialization of the Department, and a need to reduce the internal bureaucracy that has grown over the years, and take steps to become more efficient in placing police officers on the street.

Chief Johnson noted, that understanding the current economic times, the 2009 budget preparations took place in the fall of 2008, the Board indicated that it would hold to 61 officers as opposed to the 62 officers that was previously approved. He noted that in his discussions with Mr. Wolfe, he indicated that he could look at alternative scheduling, a 12-hour schedule that would increase manpower on the street, using 58 officers, plus one officer assigned full-time to

the Dauphin County Drug Task Force (DCDTF). He noted that there are only 57 officers on the force, as a result of resignations and the tragic death of Detective Allegrini. He noted, as of Friday, the number will be 56 officers, with the retirement of Sergeant Anderson.

Chief Johnson explained that the Department has established a hiring list, after conducting testing in March of this year. He noted that background investigations have been conducted on some of the top candidates on the list, and he is prepared to hire as many as three officers, upon receiving approval from the Board, to bring the compliment to 59 officers.

Chief Johnson explained that the bargaining unit made a request to him to change from eight-hour shifts to 12-hour shifts. He noted that 12-hour shifts are not commonplace in the law enforcement community, however, it is growing. He noted that Susquehanna and Derry Townships, several departments in the Lancaster and York areas, and the State College Police Departments have all moved to 12-hour shifts. He noted that Swatara Township is studying the 12-hour shift concept, although they are having some union issues. He noted that he has been contacted by several chiefs who have requested information on the 12-hour shift.

Chief Johnson noted that the obvious benefit to the 12-hour shift is that the employees work a lot less days in the year although they still work the same number of hours. Mr. Hornung questioned if they would overlay the 40-hour workweek. Chief Johnson answered, in a 14-day cycle, the officers would work 84 hours, however, he would reduce one of those days to an eight-hour shift. He noted that, in most instances, the eight-hour shift would occur when the call activity is at its lowest. Mr. Seeds questioned if there would be a need for additional overtime. Chief Johnson answered that he could cut overtime significantly. Mr. Hornung noted his store employees have gone to ten-hour shifts, and it has worked out better. He noted that the employees are happy, and he has better coverage. He suggested that a 12-hour shift would be too difficult as his employees are on their feet all day long.

Chief Johnson noted that he has been told that the 12-hour shift results in a huge change in morale, with a report of improved family life, fewer health issues, and officers are more rested on their day off. Mr. Hornung noted, with having more days off, they would be able to schedule their doctors appointments during those times. Mr. Hawk noted that the officers would be working 15 days out of 30 days per month. Chief Johnson answered that was correct, as each officer would end up with an additional 73 days a year off, but working the same amount of hours.

Mr. Crissman questioned what the advantages are for the Township. Chief Johnson answered that it would immediately increase the manpower requirements on the street from a range of four to six officers. He noted that all shift would have a minimum of six officers, except between the hours of 2 a.m. and 6 a.m. He noted that the call volume and accident volume is extremely low during this time period. He noted that the 12-hour shift would reduce the overtime costs significantly, by utilizing a duty officer to attend preliminary hearings for arrests on information received. He explained that he spoke to both Magisterial Judges Lindsey and Wenner and they have agreed to allow the Township to utilize a duty officer. He noted that any officer could provide testimony for “information received cases,” and the Township could use officers working on the day of the hearing instead of paying the arresting officer a minimum of two hours overtime. He noted that Susquehanna Township reported, in the first year of using a duty officer, a \$20,000 reduction in court overtime. Mr. Seeds questioned if this would be true for a traffic stop. Chief Johnson answered that the arresting officer would have to appear for his hearing.

Chief Johnson explained that a 14-day rotation would provide for two weeks of daylight, and two weeks of night shift which would allow the Magisterial Judges to schedule the hearing for the officers while they are working. He noted that it would work for a monthly schedule as well, as opposed to, currently, where it would be two more months before the officer would return to the daylight shift. He noted that most hearings occur 30 to 40 days after the charge has been filed.

Mr. Seeds noted a short turnover from one shift to another interrupts a persons sleep cycle. He noted that the officers are used to switching shifts. Chief Johnson explained that officers change shifts every month. He noted that he submitted a 14-day schedule which is the most popular schedule; however, there is an option for a monthly schedule. He noted, either way, the Magisterial Judges would have flexibility to schedule the officer when they are scheduled to work.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there would be a crossover of officers to cover the change of shift. Chief Johnson noted that the Traffic Safety Unit would be renamed the Special Operations Division, and would work overlapping shifts. He noted that he would merge the Traffic Safety Unit with the Community Policing Unit, noting the removal of a Sergeant, Corporal and three or four officers from specialty positions, and have them report to one Sergeant and Corporal and move the rest of the officers to the patrol platoons. He noted that he would also stagger the

Traffic Safety Unit to work the peak hours as well. He noted that there is no need to have an officer from the Traffic Safety Unit working between the hours of midnight to 6 a.m. Mr. Seeds questioned if officers from that unit work a Monday and Saturday off schedule. Chief Johnson explained that detectives work Monday through Saturday and then Tuesday through Friday. He noted that no detectives are assigned to work on Sundays.

Mr. Crissman questioned what the downside would be to the 12-hour shift. Chief Johnson answered that there are no expected downsides, however, there are concerns regarding reduction in productivity, increase in sick leave, increase in overtime, and an increase in disciplinary action. He noted that the organizations that he spoke with have not experienced these issues, but if any of these issues start to occur, then the Township would have the right to return to the eight-hour shift schedule. Mr. Crissman questioned if the bargaining unit clearly understands this. Chief Johnson answered that they do. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township has not entered formal negotiations to do this yet, and the possible change is only in preliminary talks.

Chief Johnson noted, if the Department receives any complaints about the decrease in level of service, then it would have the ability to return to the original schedule. He noted that he would not expect this to happen as it falls to the supervisors and lieutenants, and ultimately the chief of police.

Mr. Seeds noted that the criminal investigation unit would not work the 12-hour shifts. Chief Johnson noted that the Traffic Safety Unit would work 12-hour shifts, however, the School Resource Officers, Community Police Officers, Warrant Officers, etc. would continue to work an eight-hour shift, working 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, noting that they would be able to adjust their schedules as needed.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the history of the 12-hour shift from the local police departments that are using it has been positive. Chief Johnson answered that he has spoken to more than ten chiefs, and no one has experienced anything negative. He explained that he has worked the current schedule and the eight-day stretch is hard to work, especially if an officer is scheduled for court on his days off, and then must work another seven days straight, that count amounts to working 17 days without a day off. Mr. Seeds noted that the new schedule would save on overtime costs. Chief Johnson noted, in meeting with the officers, they all agree, that by the time they have reach day six of the eight-day schedule they cannot wait for it to be over. He noted that productivity drops, mistakes occur, and complaints are received.

Chief Johnson noted that morale seems to be fine at this time, and he is keeping tabs on it. He noted, over the past weekend, officers generated over 250 contacts, the majority of which were written warnings. He noted that he does not have a problem with that although it does affect revenues. He noted that the officers are being productive at this time.

Chief Johnson noted that if the compliment stays at 61 officers the savings would be \$125,000 in 2009, \$145,000 in 2010, and approximately \$165,000 in 2011.

Mr. Hornung questioned how lunch breaks would be handled. Chief Johnson explained that the officers would be allowed a 30-minute lunch break, but they are paid for their lunch break, and are not guaranteed a lunch. He questioned if there is a requirement for a break after working so many hours. Chief Johnson noted that there are no requirements for police and fire workers. He noted that the civilian staff are guaranteed a lunch and breaks. Mr. Hornung questioned if the police officers can smoke in their vehicles. Chief Johnson answered that they are not allowed to smoke in police vehicles. He noted that he does not know of any officers that smoke. Mr. Wolfe suggested that with the exception of the Public Works Department, the remainder of the work force is smoke free.

Mr. Hornung noted that vacations may be hard to schedule. Chief Johnson noted that all work time would be converted from days to hours. Mr. Hornung noted that holidays may be tricky as well.

Mr. Crissman suggested that all discussion should remain general in nature as specific questions should be held in executive session.

Chief Johnson noted that he has informed the bargaining committee that he is willing to work with them, but he won't give up the farm.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the most immediate concern is the approved compliment of officers. He noted that Chief Johnson is requesting to reduce the approved compliment to 59 officers, noting that one officer would be assigned to the Drug Task Force, and that the current compliment would be at 56 as of next week. He noted that the budget would allow employing 61 officers, but with the current economic crises, the Township cannot replace to the 61 compliment. He noted that Chief Johnson has created a plan that would work with 59 officers.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Wolfe if he was in favor of the 12-hour shift. Mr. Wolfe answered that he was. He noted that the approved compliment should be 59 officers, although financially, it would be easier to get through the budget crisis with 56 officers, however, personnel wise, there are three good candidates ready to be hired to bring the Department back

up to the compliment of 59 officers. He noted that the three candidates would have to attend the police academy and would not be available for active service for six-months. He suggested that the Township should move forward and hire the three officers to maintain the compliment of 59 officers. Mr. Crissman agreed, as well as Mr. Seeds.

Mr. Hornung questioned what portion of the savings would be affected from reducing manpower from 61 officers to 59 officers. Chief Johnson noted that he would be in favor of eliminating two positions from now until 2011. Mr. Wolfe noted that Chief Johnson has not factored the savings in overtime, noting that the listed savings are the minimum amount. Mr. Hawk suggested that it could increase another \$20,000. Chief Johnson noted that he is looking at other areas to reduce costs.

Mr. Hawk noted that the Department should move swiftly to hire the candidates or it may lose them to another Department. Chief Johnson noted if the Township does not hire one of the candidates, Susquehanna Township will. Mr. Hornung questioned if the Department would have to wait to implement the 12-hour shift until after the three new officers are hired and working. Chief Johnson answered that he could implement the new schedule as soon as possible, as the three new officers would not be working on the road until December.

Mr. Crissman noted that the Township would have to open the contract to negotiate these changes. Mr. Wolfe noted that, given the fact that the bargaining committee has approached the Township, they have opened the door. Mr. Crissman noted that any discussions regarding these issues should be discussed in executive session. Chief Johnson noted that he had each Sergeant check with each member of the Patrol Division, and all members with the exception of one, signed off on the 12-hour shift.

Mr. Wolfe noted, if the Board concurs with the 12-hour shift as a viable option, and 59 officers would become the approved compliment, staff would process three officers for hiring, start mid-term bargaining with the Police Department, and bring formal proposals to the Board in executive session. Mr. Hornung questioned if staff needed a decision tonight to hire the three additional officers. Mr. Wolfe answered that he needs the Board's concurrence. Mr. Wolfe noted that the new officers would be sworn in during the July 7th meeting; however, they would be hired July 6th to start the police academy. He noted that a budget workshop session is scheduled for June 23, and if the Board member's saw red flags, they could reconsider the potential hiring at that point. Mr. Crissman noted that he would not mind calling a special meeting to hire the three officers if needed. Mr. Hornung noted that Mr. Blain should be a part of the decision

making process. Mr. Wolfe noted that there is time to hire the officers, but his concern is, after reviewing the budget numbers, there may be decisions made not to hire any additional employees. He noted that staff is working on the backgrounds, and all that needs to be done is to make an offer of employment, and then the psychological, physical, and drug testing must be completed.

Review of the Township's proposed Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant (EECBG) program

Mr. Wolfe noted that Lower Paxton Township, with the exception of a few police hiring grants, has never been an entitlement community. He noted that there have been entitlement programs for larger communities across the nation for years. He explained that the Community Development Block Grant program (CDBG) has provided funds to the Township through Dauphin County as an entitlement program; however, once the Township reaches the population of 50,000, the Township would become an entitlement community and receive an allocation of CDBG funds on an annual basis.

Mr. Wolfe noted the new Energy Efficiency and Conservation Block Grant program (EECBG) is an entitlement program structured as part of the current stimulus package, and the population threshold for direct funding from the Federal government is 35,000 people. He noted that in Dauphin County, Lower Paxton Township and the City of Harrisburg are entitlement communities, and because of that, the County's population of non-entitlement communities is so small that the County is not a direct entitlement, as compared to York and Cumberland counties that do have large municipalities that allow the County to be an entitlement community.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township is expected to receive \$185,200 in entitlement funds in accordance with the EECBG program. He noted that the Township must apply by June 25, 2009, and submit a comprehensive energy efficiency program report by mid-August. He noted that the Township must agree to spend the funds in accordance with the permitted uses, and all of this must be done through the U.S. Department of Energy.

Mr. Wolfe noted, at staff level, three basic activities that could be funded, one which would be leveraged by the PA DCNR, for energy efficiency enhancements at the Friendship Center (FC). He noted that the three projects are as follows: LED lighting conversions in the parking lots at the Municipal Center, Friendship Center, and the Public Works Operations;

energy efficiency improvements at the FC, and energy lighting improvements at the Public Works Building.

Mr. Wolfe explained that he provided the Board members with a narrative description of the Federal Program. He noted that it explains what the Township must do to receive the money, and what the Township is allowed to use the money for. He noted that the application is very cumbersome, and he could incorporate any projects that would affect energy usage, such as transportation improvements for traffic signal, street lighting, some homeowner loan programs for energy audits, and enhancements for residential structures, creating a revolving loan fund. He noted that the opportunities are many, but the funding for the Township is not significant. He noted that in Pennsylvania, Lower Paxton Township has one of the smallest entitlement amounts. He noted that the large counties and cities have received funding in the millions of dollars

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township must come up with a comprehensive strategy, reduce it to writing, and submit it by the deadline date.

Mr. Seeds noted that the Public Works Building needs an addition, and the lighting is poor to start with. Mr. Wolfe agreed that the lighting is terrible, and the plan is to take the existing garage bay areas and enhance the lighting using compact high density florescent lights. He noted that it would be more efficient than what is currently in use. He noted that this is not the same situation for the FC, as it would be conservation in lighting for the proposed retrofits.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he included the grant application packet, noting that it would be an electronic submission. He noted that the last four pages are the project specific activities, the first of which is basic engineering services. He noted that he allocated \$20,000 for this. He noted that the second project would be the energy retrofits in the parking lots of the Municipal Center, Public Works Facility, and FC, converting the current lights to LED parking lot canopy and building wall mounted lights. He noted that there is a cost estimate for this work which is necessary for the application, and there must be a determination of the energy savings. He noted that between the efforts of Mr. Robbins and Mr. Luetchford, they already had partial energy audits of their facility in place through HRG, Inc.

Mr. Wolfe noted, for the FC, Mr. Luetchford had a detail energy study completed for the facility that was reviewed by the Board of Supervisors earlier this year. He noted that many of the enhancements, such as the low-flow shower heads, and installing compact florescent light kits in the existing lights in the social halls and fitness area are already underway and not included, but there is a list of a number of activities for energy improvement at the FC. He

explained that these activities correspond with a grant submitted to PA DCNR requesting \$105,000 of State funds. He noted that he hopes to match the Block Grant funds with the State funds to pay for all or most of the activities.

Mr. Wolfe explained that the final project would be improving the interior lighting at the FC and doing it in an energy conservation fashion, using high output florescent lights, and removing old lighting that have ballasts that no longer work properly, and in some instances, it would increase the amount of lighting available.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he hoped that the Board would grant approval for him to submit the application for funding.

Review of request from Dauphin County to use certain Township properties as
Temporary Debris Storage and Reduction sites

Mr. Wolfe explained that he received a letter from the Dauphin County Emergency Operations Center requesting the Township to allow them to list the Township parks and Public Compost Facility as temporary debris storage and reduction sites for the municipality in the case of a major catastrophic storm event. He noted that the County would need to reference locations within a plan document and they are proposing Koons, Brightbill and Kohl Parks as well as George Park and the Compost Facility. He suggested that the Public Works site could be added as a potential location.

Mr. Hawk noted that temporary can be a nebulous term. Mr. Crissman questioned if the list would be a priority listing. Mr. Hawk suggested that the Compost Facility should be the first location on the list. Mr. Wolfe suggested that the Township could prioritize the list.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the Township would be receiving refuge from outside the Township. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would not be refuge, rather trees, brush, and yard waste. Mr. Hornung questioned, what if a building blows up. Mr. Wolfe noted that it could be construction debris as well. Mr. Hawk noted that a prioritized listing should be developed.

Mr. Seeds questioned what the letter meant by “reducing on site”. Mr. Wolfe answered that they would chip and compact it on site and take it to the appropriate location. Mr. Seeds questioned how long the debris would be stored at these locations. He noted in 1972, and again in 1975, the flood debris was stored at HACC for quite a while. He noted that it started to smell bad and attract rodents. He noted that he would not want the parks to be tied up with something like that. Mr. Hornung noted that that is what he would see occurring. Mr. Seeds noted that he

would like to see a time limit for all the work to be completed. Mr. Hornung questioned if all the Townships would be doing this. Mr. Wolfe answered that he assumes that the County sent the same letter to all the communities.

Mr. Wolfe noted that you can be in portions of this community that are 30 minutes away from the Compost Facility. He suggested that the Township could list the Wolfersberger Tract as well. Mr. Hornung suggested that each location could be specific as to what it would take. Mr. Crissman suggested that the Township could do whatever it wants to do.

Mr. Hornung noted that the yard waste is less obnoxious than construction debris that would smell. Mr. Wolfe questioned if the Board wanted to accept construction debris. Mr. Crissman noted that he would rather use the Wolfersberger Tract as opposed to a developed park. He noted that he likes the idea of using the land fill as an area and designating what kind of things would be accepted at what areas.

Mr. Seeds questioned who would provide the security and maintenance at these sits. Mr. Wolfe noted that typically, they don't fence these type of places. Mr. Hornung noted if you have construction debris, people will route through it, therefore it would be a good idea to keep construction debris in a fenced area to keep people out. He noted that he would be concerned with the water runoff for that area.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would write a letter to Dauphin County requesting some answers for the questions posed by the Board Members. Mr. Crissman agreed, noting that he would like to be able to separate the debris.

Mr. Stine explained that the debris from the 1972 flood was buried along Elmerton Avenue where the DEP building was built.

Review of the park planning process prepared by the Parks and Recreation Board, and the proposed application of the process for the Wolfersberger Tract

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Luetchford, through the Parks and Recreation Board, has suggested a park planning schedule for the Wolfersberger Tract using a park planning process that the Parks and Recreation Board has developed. He noted that the process was used successfully in the planning of the Thomas B. George Jr. Park.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Parks and Recreation Board reviewed its work from the development of the George Park, reduced it to writing and provided a formal park planning

process. He noted that they applied it through a specific park planning process for milestone events for the planning of the Wolfersberger Tract.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Parks and Recreation Board would like to proceed with the planning process for the Wolfersberger Tract in accordance with the developed schedule, with the Board's concurrence, or meet with the Board of Supervisors to discuss it further.

Mr. Seeds noted that number seven of the draft schedule states to retain professional services to draw property plans; noting that the date should read 1/6/10 and not 1/6/09. He suggested that that timeline is very aggressive, and that would cost some money to do. He suggested that with the budget problems, there would be no money to do that next year. He noted that the public meetings cost very little. Mr. Crissman questioned if the Board would want to stop their process, and if they don't keep to the timeline, he would not want to throw a damper on it.

Mr. Hornung noted, that number four, to compile all input, prioritize and then update it along the way, should be done first. He noted that he has never seen a report from the Parks and Recreation Board of what the most demand is for and the least amount of ability to fill it. He questioned if there was a means to put a number on that. He suggested that the Parks and Recreation Board needs to determine where the shortages are and then go through the process trying to accommodate it. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Luetchford did that in the park plan that he prepared for the fee-in-lieu process. He noted that he has determined what facilities the Township is lacking based upon demand and population. He noted, for the major activity areas, there is a demand for more than what the Township has. Mr. Hornung questioned where is the greatest demand, knowing that the Township does not meet the amount of park space needed per resident. Mr. Wolfe noted that the shortage would be for the activities that the Township does not have yet, such as the skate park, and up until recently, the dog park.

Mr. Crissman suggested that this could be accomplished by number three, scheduling public input meetings. Mr. Hornung noted that, in many instances, the person who yells the loudest, get what he wants and it may not provide the answer that he is looking for. He suggested that staff who schedules the fields may also have an answer for this question. He noted that he would like to see a prioritized list created as part of the park planning process based upon need. Mr. Wolfe suggested that section 4-a, in the process, would accomplish this as it notes to determine community needs utilizing existing plans, studies and policies. Mr. Hornung noted that it should be an up-to-date list to accommodate a developer, who may question, when

he is developing his land, what is the Township's greatest need. Mr. Wolfe noted that the community's need for that area would have to be taken into account, and not the overall Township community. He noted in the southeast quadrant, the Parks Department needs everything, but if you are in the Linglestown area, the Township is in good shape. Mr. Crissman noted that what Mr. Hornung is asking for would be accomplished by 4-a in the draft plan. He would suggest that they would study what is over and under utilized, and what does not exist. Mr. Hornung suggested that it should be accomplished very early in the process and revised periodically for the entire Township. He noted that it would provide a direction as to where the resources should be used. Mr. Crissman suggested that the Parks and Recreation Board may already have a list of prioritized needs.

Mr. Wolfe explained that the Comprehensive Park Report that Mr. Luetchford prepared for the fee-in-lieu for the SALDO contains this information in a community-wide format. He noted, if he had \$1million he would not necessarily be able to target what should be built first, however, he would be able to say what the major priorities are to be built.

Mr. Greg Doyle, Carmen Court, questioned if the park planning process would be made available to the public. Mr. Hornung provided Mr. Doyle with a copy of the draft report. Mr. Doyle explained that he lives south of the Wolfersberger Tract and the neighbors were happy to know that the Township bought the land to use as parkland. He noted that they were not happy when they heard that it could be developed as a large soccer complex, due to the traffic and road conditions on Wenrich Street. Mr. Hornung noted that major improvements would have to be made to Wenrich Street before a park could be developed. Mr. Doyle noted that he would be concerned with lighted facilities and public address systems that would disrupt the peace and quiet of the neighborhood. Mr. Crissman noted that the copy provided to Mr. Doyle is only a draft at this time.

Mr. Doyle questioned if there are any plans for CASA to purchase part of the Wolfersberger Tract. Mr. Hawk suggested, at this time, all discussions are off the table. Mr. Hornung noted that it would be very difficult to develop future parks without private money. He noted that there is no money to develop that land; therefore, a joint partnership would have to occur. Mr. Doyle noted that CASA stated that they were planning to build eight soccer fields and hired a consultant who told them that they needed 20 soccer fields. He noted that the traffic and noise associated with 20 soccer fields would be too much. Mr. Hornung noted that what CASA wanted and what they could place on that site were two different things. Mr. Doyle suggested

that a private organization owning the land without regulations for times and alcohol consumption was a concern. Mr. Hornung noted that many of those regulations are written into the Township ordinances. Mr. Doyle questioned if the land would continue to be owned by the Township. Mr. Hornung answered that he did not know because the discussions did not go that far.

Review of the report to the Supervisors prepared by the Koons Memorial Swim Club

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Koons Memorial Swim Club submitted a financial statement to the Board for their review, noting that the Township has co-signed on a construction loan and a long-term loan for the swim club with Centric Bank. Mr. Hornung noted that the report is a great improvement over previous information supplied to the Township.

Mr. Wolfe noted that they listed the total income to date as of May 18, 2009 as \$7,191.02. He noted that they spent \$1,438.79, with outstanding bills of \$1,799.99. He noted that the balance at Centric Bank is \$6,916.21 and a balance in their checking account of \$12,667.44.

Mr. Wolfe noted that they supplied a description of the pool facility, their operations, Red Cross Learn To Swim Program and day care revenue. He noted that they also supplied the status of their bank loan and line of credit from Centric Bank, Statement of Cash, Membership Report and fundraising efforts.

Mr. Seeds noted that he is very pleased that the pool complies with the Virginia Graeme Baker Pool and Spa Safety Act. Mr. Wolfe noted that they stated that they are in compliance.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the FC is coming into compliance and doing so in a relatively economically viable fashion. He noted that economical covers are being installed in the pool for the drains.

Mr. Hornung noted that he spoke with Mr. Walter Shatto, who is a chemical engineer, and he said that he was doing similar things that Mr. Luetchford stated that he was doing. He noted that he told him that no one will inform pool owners if they met the requirements are not, as it is a very vague area. Mr. Crissman noted that the Department of Health visited the FC, and Mr. Luetchford explained what he was doing, and the inspector told him that it sounded like common sense to him.

Mr. Seeds noted that he was concerned that Koons Park only had 35 family memberships. Mr. Wolfe noted that the report was dated May 18, 2009. Mr. Hornung noted that the weather has not been conducive to swimming either. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board should have some

concerns about the facility and the future long-term viability. He noted that they are very organized, and this is the best the Township has seen in five years.

“Otta Know” Presentation
COMCAST cable television franchise negotiations

Mr. Wolfe noted that as a member of the Capital Region Council of Governments (CAPCOG), the Township is participating in the joint negotiations of the cable franchise renewal with COMCAST cable television. He noted that the franchise for the Township expires next year, and the participating municipalities are numbered at 25. He noted that they are listed in the exhibit in the memorandum from Dan Cohen. He is the legal counsel retained by the CAPCOG for this negotiation. He noted that Mr. Cohen negotiated the Verizon franchise, and also negotiated the last franchise with Sammons Communications. He noted that there are now 26 municipalities that are involved in the negotiations, and that provides for a lower cost to pay per municipality for the attorney fees. He noted that the cost is roughly \$3,150, and if the Township was negotiating on its own, the costs would be much higher. Mr. Seeds noted that the Township pays the same amount as the smaller boroughs.

Mr. Wolfe noted, at some point in time, the Board would be asked to approve the franchise agreement by resolution.

IMPROVEMENT GUARANTEES

Mr. Hawk noted that there were three Improvement Guarantees.

CGOH – Oncology Center

A reduction in a letter of credit, with Wachovia Bank, in the amount of \$230,000.00, with an expiration date of November 3, 2009.

Mindy Meadows, Phase I

An extension and 10% increase in a letter of credit, with Fulton Bank, in the amount of \$19,057.50, with an expiration date of June 9, 2010.

Old Iron Estates, Phases I & III

An extension and 10% increase in a letter of credit, with Fulton Bank, in the amount of \$33,783.75, with an expiration date of June 9, 2010.

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

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Seeds seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 8:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman
Township Secretary