

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Board Meeting held October 9, 2007

A workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 7:32 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; Daniel Bair, Public Safety Director; Jeff Case, Arora and Associates; Eric Kessler, Village of Linglestown Committee; John Hollenbach, United Water PA; Cheri Fogarty, Community Planning Consultant, Inc.; John Rautzahn, McCormick Taylor, Inc; John Bachman, PENNDOT District 8; Brian St. John, Matt Best, Gannet Fleming; Barry Calhoun, Ginny Stapf, South Central Emergency Medical Services; Keith Cerzullo, Chief Doug Lowman, Paxtonia Fire Company; Assistant Chief Tom Swank, Robert Coburn, Colonial Park Fire Company; and Chief Perry Pierich, Linglestown Fire Company.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Public Comment

None was presented.

Discussion with the Village of Linglestown Committee regarding various items affecting the Linglestown Project

Mr. Wolfe explained that he provided the Board members with a memorandum noting the issues to be discussed at this meeting. He stated that the Village of Linglestown Square Project (VOLSP) has revenues of federal funding in the amount of \$4 million, to include the Federal Transportation Bill earmark secured by Congressman Holden and Senator Specter. He noted that the project also includes funds from the HomeTown Streets Grant in the amount of \$680,000. He explained that the Township is required to match the two funding resources with 20% local funds, and noted that these monies are set aside for construction. In addition, the project must fund engineering design, right-of-way, and utility relocation activities. He noted that the funds available for this portion of the plan, to include the Township's match to federal funds, totals \$360,000. He stated that the cost estimate of the remaining non-construction activities are the

engineer's supplemental agreement of \$135,000, which was approved for the acquisition phase, legal services and payments for easements, right-of-ways, and damage to property owners for their acquisitions. He noted that approximately \$185,000 in revenues remains to pay for the payment of damages. He explained if the payments for acquisitions exceed \$185,000, then the Township and PENNDOT would have to come up with the additional funds.

Mr. Case explained that the current cost estimate for the project is \$3.9 million, to include the HomeTown Streets monies and the beautification items that go with it. He explained that that includes a 20% contingency since many of the current bids that PENNDOT receives are coming in over budget.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the project is projected to cost \$3.9 million with roughly \$4 million in funds. He noted that the federal funds are not guaranteed, but are based upon federal yearly appropriations. He noted that, at this time, the project is okay for funding, but the acquisition costs are unknown at this time.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there is a need to install public water in the Village from Pennsylvania Avenue to Balthaser Street. He explained that John Hollenbach, United Water PA, is present, to address the Board members regarding the process and estimate of costs for water service. He noted that Mr. Hollenbach has reviewed the original estimate of costs provided to the Board members, and has revised the total amount.

Mr. Hollenbach stated that he was asked to take another look at the project costs, and explained that the costs that were previously submitted to the Township were based upon a 2,700 foot main extension that included road restoration. He noted that based on the tariff, if there were existing residential customers who desired to connect to the water service, they would be classified as a bona fide customer and eligible to receive a \$3,000 rebate. He noted that, at this time, only 24 property owners expressed interest in connecting to the water service. He noted that the contribution made by UWPA would be roughly \$75,000.

Mr. Hollenbach questioned if there were 48 homes to connect to the service. Mr. Case noted that there was a potential for 90 connections for water service. Mr. Hollenbach noted that he would need a confirmation for that number. He explained that the material costs for the main line, valves, and fire hydrants would be roughly \$90,000. He noted that the installation costs average between \$75 to \$100 per foot, pending on restoration, but, if this work could be coordinated with the contractor completing the roadwork; he suggested that the main line could be installed in the shoulder of the road as it exists now. He noted that the total cost could

decrease considerably if the contractor did the road restoration work. He noted that the \$90,000 rate was based on the national contract price.

Mr. Seeds questioned how long the water main would be. Mr. Hollenbach answered that it would be roughly 2,700 feet in length. He noted that he has authorization, as the local manager, for work up to \$50,000, but he would need to receive approval for this project. He noted that the material and the services for the customers would cost roughly \$1,000 per service for each customer. He noted that United Water PA would install the service to the property line, at this time, since it would not make sense to go back and do it at a later time. He noted that he would like to see as many customers hook up as possible, noting that the customer would need to pay a plumber to run the service from their property line to the home. He noted that United Water PA would also have to install a meter pit and a meter that would cost roughly \$150. He noted that if he received approval from the company, he would be willing to pay for the materials if the contractor completed the road restoration costs.

Mr. Wolfe questioned what the Township's cost would be. Mr. Hollenbach noted that he would need to negotiate this with the contractor to find out what the installation costs would be to place the pipe. He explained that there is no existing main to work around and that would make the job easier. He noted that the contractor would need to be a United Water PA approved contractor, and suggested that most of the larger contractors are approved. He stated that he could provide a list of the approved contractors to the Township.

Mr. Kessler noted that only 24 property owners signed up at the time, but many others did not sign up because they did not believe that it would occur. Mr. Kessler questioned if the water service would stop at the property line. Mr. Hollenbach answered yes. Mr. Kessler questioned if Mr. Hollenbach would install the services for all the property owners. Mr. Hollenbach noted that he would, but he might not install the meter pit at that point, he would install the curb stop at the property line, and as people apply for service, then he would install a meter pit and meter. Mr. Kessler noted that the Committee feels that once it is known that there is a guarantee of water service, then most people would chose to connect. He noted that many residents have well issues, and most of the structures in the Village are old and wooden, and if a fire occurred, numerous homes could easily be lost. Mr. Hollenbach noted that the price also includes four fire hydrants for that area of the Village. He suggested that most of the people would sign up for water service.

Mr. Seeds noted that, for many residents, the service would be, under road, curb, and sidewalk with no grass areas. He questioned what would happen when residents decided to connect to the service at a later time and the new sidewalks or trees are in the way.

Mr. Kessler questioned if a double service line could be run in the area of the bulb outs. Mr. Wolfe noted that this would not address the 90 connections. He noted that this is the same issue for sanitary sewer. He noted if the property owners don't connect, the Township cannot run the private portion for the resident. Mr. Seeds suggested that the Township may need to have a meeting with the residents to explain the situation. He noted that, in some instances, municipalities have loan the property owners on fixed incomes the money to connect, and they repay the loan or a lien is put on their homes. He noted that to go back later and dig up the sidewalks would be ludicrous. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township would have the legal authority to mandate a connection to water if it is within 150 feet of the property line.

Mr. Hawk questioned why only 24 residents responded to an interest in water service. Mr. Kessler answered that some do not believe the project will happen, and for others, it is the unknown cost. He noted that once these issues are resolved, he suggested that most residents would want to connect to water, and he noted that it would be a good suggestion to mandate the connections.

Mr. Case noted that PENNDOT would not expend federal construction funds for the public utility. Mr. Wolfe noted that any costs for utility work would need to be paid by the Township. Mr. Seeds questioned if the Township could utilize Dauphin County funds. Mr. Wolfe answered that there are no County funds available, as those funds are already pledged.

Chief Pierich acknowledged that the water main would cost a lot of money to install, and someone needs to pay for it, but, he explained that there is a fire hydrant at Blue Mountain Parkway and Balthaser Street, and the closest one on Mountain Road is located at Stephenson Avenue at the Linglestown Junior High School. He noted that there are no fire hydrants or public water for fire suppression in the central business district that is made up of old wooden structures that are located very close to each other. He noted that it is a highly combustible, populated area. He noted that the Fire Company can function to do its best, but he strongly requested to have fire hydrants installed to provide water for a fire suppression system to the Village. He requested the Board members to find a way to install the water mains for the fire hydrant service.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Kessler would like to see the Township mandate that property owners must connect to the water service. He noted that that would raise the number of people who would sign up. Mr. Kessler noted that it would provide for 100% compliance in the

area. He noted that there would be some people who may experience a financial hardship to connect to water, but since many of the homes are located so close to the road, it would not result in a huge fee for a plumber to install the connections to the homes. Mr. Kessler suggested that the number of interested parties would triple if the project was guaranteed to happen, and they had an estimate of what it would cost to connect to the water service. Mr. Wolfe noted if all the parties connected to the water line, there would be no costs to the property owners, except for the cost to make the private connection. Mr. Kessler questioned if that work would need to be prevailing wages. Mr. Wolfe answered that it would not as it would be paid by the property owner. Mr. Kessler questioned if a bid could be made for this private service. Mr. Wolfe noted that it could not be part of the project work. Mr. Kessler suggested that the Committee could get prices from a plumber to do this work for a group rate and possibly save the property owners money. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township would not be able to get involved in this as it involves work on private property. Mr. Crissman noted that the Committee could do this, but the Township could not do this. Mr. Wolfe noted that the water connections for each home would be different, and the cost would differ for each home depending on the amount of work needed to be done. Mr. Kessler suggested that the bid would be based on a linear foot.

Mr. Seeds questioned what size pipe the water company would use. Mr. Hollenbach answered that a residential connection would use ¾" pipe, but a larger line would be used for the businesses.

Mr. Hollenbach noted that each resident would have to physically disconnect their well from the plumbing due to possible backflow contamination. He noted that property owners could continue to use their wells for gardening, but not for any inside plumbing. He noted that the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) would not allow this.

Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be wise to have the members of the Committee meet with the property owners to find out how many would be interested in connecting to water service. Mr. Hollenbach noted that he would be willing to attend the meeting. Mr. Kessler noted that he would like to provide the property owners with a range for their installation cost. He suggested that some property owners may find it a financial hardship to connect to water. Mr. Seeds noted that the Board should discuss the issue of making loans available to the residents. Mr. Kessler noted that he would like to secure some estimates from plumbers to do the work. Mr. Seeds noted that that would be a good idea. He noted that Mr. Kessler would need to know if there is a possibility that local government may be able to provide loans. Mr. Kessler noted that he would not mention this when he speaks to the property owners. He noted that he would be reluctant to

discuss this until Mr. Hollenbach gets back to Mr. Wolfe to provide the actual costs for installation. Mr. Kessler noted that it is not the Committee's job to offer terms for loans, but to inquire as to who is interested in connecting to water service. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would wait to hear from Mr. Hollenbach before anything else is done. Mr. Stine questioned Mr. Hollenbach if the plumber installing the private connection had to be approved by United Water PA. Mr. Hollenbach answered no, but they must use approved materials. Mr. Seeds noted that, generally, the material is copper. Mr. Hollenbach noted that either copper or plastic pipe could be used.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Committee wanted to discuss the issue of alley improvements. He noted that the Township's position is that right-of-way is needed before improvements can be made. He noted that the Committee also requested that Blackberry Alley be one-way, westbound, from the Church to the new bypass road. Mr. Wolfe noted that any improvements made to the alleys would be completed with local funds.

Mr. Kessler noted that the Committee would like Blackberry Alley one-way westbound and paved, and ultimately, work completed on the eastern section of Blackberry Alley, to be designated as eastbound only. He noted that the Township is providing satellite parking, but no paved streets to access it. He noted that it is his opinion that the alleys are public, but Mr. Stine does not agree with his opinion. He noted that Mr. Case could supply the Committee with the names and addresses for the property owners that abut Blackberry Alley from Mountain Road to Blue Mountain Road, and the Committee could make contact with them to secure a quick claim deed for the alley.

Mr. Stine noted if someone petitioned to open Blackberry Alley, as a public street, then a public hearing for the ordinance to open the street would need to be held. He noted that the property owners that abut the alley must sign an agreement agreeing that they are not damaged by opening the alley as a public street. Mr. Kessler noted that it would be a voluntary giving instead of a taking.

Mr. Stine explained that if the property owners do not agree to open the road, they would be entitled to a Board of Review to determine if they had been damaged by the Township opening the alley as a public street. Mr. Kessler suggested that this would be a more logical way to proceed, and he stated that he would contact Mr. Stine to inquire as to how to go about making the petition. Mr. Wolfe questioned if the Village of Linglestown Committee could petition the Township. Mr. Stine answered that the people in the Committee could do it. Mr. Wolfe

suggested that it would make sense to have the members of the Committee do this. Mr. Kessler noted that the Committee would do whatever it could to have the alleys made public.

Mr. Kessler suggested that it would benefit Mr. Hornung's business to do this. Mr. Hornung noted that he has a very small ownership to the business that he is involved in.

Mr. Kessler noted that there are safety issues that need to be addressed for the people utilizing the new parking lot, such as paving and lighting. Mr. Seeds noted that the alley would be paved to the parking lot, and there would be lighting in the parking lot. He noted that there is a light on Mountain Road, and he suggested that the alley would only need one more street light. Mr. Kessler noted that it would be logical to add lights to an existing PPL pole.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Kessler is looking for Board approval for the Committee to proceed with the petition process. Mr. Kessler noted that he would only petition for Blackberry Alley at this time since the funds are limited. Mr. Seeds suggested that Mr. Kessler should discuss this with the Committee members, and the petition should be very specific for what section of Blackberry Alley is requested to be made public. Mr. Seeds noted that Blackberry Alley does not have an egress on the eastern side of the Village.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the current plan shows satellite parking in the southeast quadrant at Koons Park, and the new parking area off of Blackberry Alley, using land leased from the Linglestown Life United Methodist Church. He noted that the Committee requested additional satellite parking on property owned by Tim Archibald in the southwest quadrant. Mr. Wolfe noted that he has had some discussions with Mr. Archibald, but it has not progressed any further. He noted that the reason for the delay in any further discussions is due to the uncertainty of the Eagle Hotel. He noted that the Board has concerns with developing additional satellite parking while the parking situation has not been resolved with the owners of the Eagle Hotel.

Mr. Kessler noted that the Committee is aware that there are limitations for funding for the satellite parking, but for the project to be an economic success for businesses, it needs parking. He noted that sixty parking spaces have been added by way of the church parking lot. He noted that he did not know how many people would walk from the Koons Park parking area to the Village Square. Mr. Kessler noted that the Committee is aware of the limitations of local funds to build satellite parking. Mr. Hawk questioned where the Township would put another parking area near the Eagle Hotel. Mr. Kessler noted that any parking consideration should have easy access, and be a safe place to park. Mr. Hawk noted that this is an on-going problem that needs to be solved.

Mr. Hornung noted that he has a difficult problem with what is going on with the Eagle Hotel. He noted that he does not want to be part of an organization that would put someone out of business. He noted that the Township has not received much cooperation with the owners in trying to resolve the issue. He noted that the only options are across the street or next door to the property. He noted that the owners of the Eagle Hotel own property across the street, and it has been said that Mr. Otto wants to sell his land. Mr. Kessler noted that it would be dangerous to have people coming out of the bar, after drinking, and crossing the street at the roundabout. He suggested that the solution would be for the owners of the Eagle Hotel to purchase Mr. Otto's land. He noted that the other option would be if the Township bought the land, but it would be perceived as benefiting only one person. He noted that it would be wonderful if a parking area could be created at the Square area. He noted that many of the local businesses would be closed during evening hours when the Eagle Hotel does most of its business. Mr. Hornung noted that there are ways to mitigate the danger of walking across the street to access a business. He noted that crosswalks and other means would make crossing the street less dangerous. Mr. Kessler noted that he is concerned that the business is a bar. He noted that the available space in that location is very limited, and he suggested that if the Township purchased Mr. Otto's land, it would be used during the day and night.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there is one last issue concerning the choice of light standards to be used for the project. He noted that there are two standards that have been chosen for the project; one a PPL light standard, and a second option that the Village Committee recommended for the project. He noted that the Village sub-Committee chose a light standard that costs roughly \$175,000, that would need to be purchased, installed, and maintained by the Township. He explained that PPL will not maintain anything that it does not install. He noted that PPL would only install their decorative lights, either the Acorn or Victorian Style lights. He noted that the costs for PPL's lights would be \$70,000 a difference of \$100,000, plus the cost of installation and maintenance. Mr. Seeds questioned how many lights would be needed. Mr. Wolfe answered that 70 lights would be needed. Mr. Kessler explained that he is looking for direction from the Board as to what light standard they would suggest. Mr. Hawk noted that he does not see the need to spend the extra money. Mr. Crissman agreed that the money could be used for a better purpose, and the PPL choices would still look appropriate for the Village and compliment the architecture of the Village. Mr. Kessler noted that many members were split on this topic, noting that the long term maintenance would need to be provided by the Township. Mr. Hawk noted that the PPL light standards would work well for the project.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he included information on the acquisition process to include the list of properties that need to be acquired, as well as the second letter sent to the property owners, entitled "Advanced Notice of Acquisition". Mr. Case noted the appraiser has completed most of the work for the strip takes and will forward the information to PENNDOT for final review. He noted that two types of acquisitions would take place for this project. He noted that the strip takes would make up 95% of the properties involved. He reported that PENNDOT should complete their review within a month, and by the end of November, the Township should be ready to make an offer to the property owners for their land.

Mr. Seeds noted that the minutes from the October 3, 2007 Workshop mentioned that Mr. Case could re-create the existing drainage system, and the sump pump systems and drains could be hooked up to that system. Mr. Case noted that this was already included in the project funds. Mr. Seeds noted that this would work in some areas were the yards drain away, but it would not work in all areas. Mr. Case noted that where the grading would not work; the water would be piped to two locations. Mr. Case noted that for Mr. Seeds' property the water would run to behind Mr. Minsker's property under the walk. Mr. Seeds noted that he did not want the water running across the sidewalk, freezing, and causing a dangerous situation.

Mr. Kessler noted that imprinted colored concrete would be installed in the sidewalks throughout the Village, and he noted that it was intended that the Supervisors would need to add something to the Ordinances to state that replacement sidewalk would need to match to the existing sidewalk.

Status Report from Cheri Fogarty, Community Planning Consultants, Inc., regarding I-83 improvements proposed in Lower Paxton Township

Mr. Wolfe noted that Ms. Fogarty would introduce members of the I-83 Master Plan project who will make a presentation to explain the work to be completed from Union Deposit Road to the I-81 connector and to include improvements on Route 22 from Franklin Street to Care Street.

Ms. Fogarty introduced John Rautzahn, who is the Project Manager. Mr. Rautzahn explained that he works for McCormick Taylor, Inc., and he introduced John Bachman, Project Manager from PENNDOT District 8; Brian St. John and Matt Best, from Gannet Fleming; and Cheri Fogarty, who is the local coordinator.

Mr. Rautzahn explained that he has met with Township staff monthly, and would like to provide an update for the project. He noted that this phase of the project was born out of the

Master Plan completed in 2003, and is in preliminary engineering stage. He noted that he would present concepts that are not etched in stone, since the project is still in the growing process. He noted that a public meeting would be held next spring, but he wanted to show the concepts to the Board members at this time.

Mr. Rautzahn explained that the project would run from Derry Street to the junction of I-81 and I-83. He noted that it would include the widening of the roadway from the two lanes in each direction to four lanes in each direction between the interchanges. He noted that there would be six lanes under the bridges at Union Deposit and Colonial Roads, and that the on and off ramps would begin before and after the interchanges. He noted that there is a proposed 26-foot median in the middle with a barrier, three through lanes, an auxiliary lane, and a shoulder on the outside. He noted that the outside treatments would be fill, or a cut, or in many places, noise barriers would be installed.

Mr. Rautzahn noted that the ideas work very well and will be a considerable improvement. He noted that most of the mainline bridge work goes over roadways at Londonderry, Megoulas and Locust Lane, whereas, the bridge over Peifers Lane would be widened. He noted that all traffic lanes would be maintained during construction. He noted that the wide shoulders would be missing, but the number of lanes would be kept open during construction. He noted that all the interchanges would be open during construction. He noted that the speed limit would be reduced from 55 mph. to 45 mph. during the construction period. He noted that the team feels that they have a good idea of how to maintain traffic during the construction period.

Mr. St. John noted that the Master Plan originally showed the Route 22 corridor on a bridge, but it was determined that another option should be chosen. He noted that, east of the existing interchange, the existing signalized intersection at Rt. 22 and Colonial Road will be replaced by three traffic signals at that intersection. He noted that the ramp from I-83 eastbound on Rt. 22 will have a signal. He noted that the ramp will have three northbound lanes off the ramp controlled by this traffic signal, and the eastbound traffic on Rt. 22 would have two left turn lanes for Colonial Road and two through lanes on Route 22 that would never stop. Mr. Crissman noted that traffic exiting onto Colonial Road from I-83 would need to be in the left ramp lane to do this. He questioned if there would be enough signage to accommodate this. Mr. St. John answered that the signage would direct a vehicle on the proper ramp to be able to make this left turn. He noted that there would be no competing traffic from eastbound Rt. 22 traffic, as there is today, due to the signal at the top of the ramp. Mr. Rautzahn noted that the ramp traffic

from I-83 would go from two lanes to four lanes. He noted that there would be overhead signage to direct the traffic. Mr. Crissman noted that this is a major problem now. Mr. Seeds questioned if there would be cameras to control the stacking from the lights. Mr. Rautzahn noted that he is very comfortable that drivers will have adequate direction to get into the proper lane. Mr. St. John noted that the left two lanes on the ramp would provide the option to go to Colonial Road, noting that the center lane would be a choice lane.

Mr. Hawk questioned what the little spur was for on the ramp. Mr. St. John explained that it would allow traffic to go west on Route 22 controlled by the traffic signal. Mr. Rautzahn noted that the center lane would accommodate Colonial Road or Route 22 eastbound. Mr. St. John noted that I-83 traffic would trigger the light at the top of the ramp. He noted that the first cause would be to clear I-83 in the event of a back up of traffic. He noted that Route 22 would not operate at a level of service A, and be a congested arterial street. He noted that the project is projected for 2035 year traffic. He noted that he is confident that the project can maintain the interstate, safety, and operations of the corridor. Mr. Seeds questioned what level of service Route 22 would be on the day the project opens. Mr. St. John noted that that calculation has not been determined yet. Mr. Rautzahn suggested that a level of service C would be about right.

Mr. Seeds questioned when the project would start. Mr. Rautzahn noted that the project is programmed on the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for preliminary engineering. Mr. Bachman noted he is attempting to get final design funding so that when he receives the environmental clearance next spring, the money would be available for final design at that time. He noted that there are no funds for the project at this time other than the funds for the preliminary design. He noted that the rest of the project needs to be funded under the TIP. He explained that his best guess is that it would cost \$150 million to complete the project, and it would not be bid in one contract. He suggested that it would entail multiple construction contracts, and this would spread the construction over time. He suggested that the project would be five years out.

Mr. Hawk questioned what the yellow rounded item was in the area of the Colonial Park Diner. Mr. St. John explained that it was a cul-de-sac. Mr. Hawk questioned how he would get to the Colonial Park Diner. Mr. St. John explained that traffic flowing eastbound on Route 22 would enter all the businesses by way of a right turn, and exit by means of a right turn. He noted that traffic coming westbound would need to enter from the streets behind the diner. Mr. Hawk questioned what would happen to the Sunoco Gas Station. Mr. St. John noted that the property would need to be acquired, and he noted that the Red Lobster is also impacted as well. Mr.

Rautzahn noted that all the frontage properties from Colonial Road to the Interstate 83 on the north side would need to be acquired.

Chief Bair questioned how pedestrians would cross Route 22 at Colonial Road. Mr. St. John noted that the project would provide pedestrian accommodations at the traffic signals. Mr. Crissman noted that many elderly people live in the apartment complex across from the Colonial Park Mall and many walk across Colonial Road. He questioned if the traffic light at the entrance to Boscov's would remain. Mr. St. John answered that it would remain as is. Mr. Crissman questioned if it would be possible for pedestrians to cross from Colonial Road at Route 22 to the Colonial Park Diner or the area of the Red Lobster. Mr. St. John answered that crosswalks would be provided.

Mr. St. John noted that traveling westbound on Route 22, the lane for Elmerton Avenue and Colonial Road would be together; one straight through lane, and the other would go north. He noted that it would greatly improve the left turn for Elmerton Avenue off of Colonial Road. He noted that continuing westbound; there would be a traffic signal west of Colonial Road, and a traffic signal at the top of the ramp. He noted from Colonial Road, traffic would make a left turn from two lanes into feeder lanes controlled by a traffic signal to head east on Route 22. He noted that the traffic from Elmerton Avenue would also use these two lanes. Mr. Crissman questioned if there would be a stacking problem on those two feeder lanes. Mr. Rautzahn noted that the two lanes should accommodate this traffic. Mr. St. John noted that the three traffic signals would run in a coordinated system to accommodate the traffic for clearing. He noted that the signal would hold the stacking traffic on Elmerton Avenue and Colonial Road, and not in the feeder lane.

Mr. Seeds questioned if some of the lanes are raised lanes. Mr. St. John noted that the logistics would be worked through to accommodate the pedestrian crossings. He noted that the existing sidewalk in the area would be replaced as part of the project. He noted that controlled crosswalks would be installed at the actual intersections, and that there are some areas that pedestrian crossings are not desired and this would be worked into the plan. He noted that the light blue area is where it is anticipated to construct sidewalks and it is planned to keep pedestrians off the south side of Route 22, from the triple ramp lane coming from I-83. Mr. Crissman questioned how pedestrians would get from Elmerton Avenue to the Colonial Park Mall. Mr. St. John noted that he would provide accommodations through the intersection.

Mr. Rautzahn noted that he has met with the Planning Commission to get a better understanding of the Bicycle/Pedestrian Greenway Plan that would be coming before the Board members. Mr. St. John noted that many of these details would be worked out in the design stage.

He noted that pedestrians would be accommodated through the interchange on Route 22 to the area of Franklin Street.

Mr. Rautzahn noted that all the loops would be removed from the plan with the exception of the westbound Route 22 to southbound I-83. He noted that the merge is a real problem at this time, but a fourth southbound lane would be created in this area to keep the flow of merging traffic moving. He noted that there would be no stopping on the ramp, therefore, there would be no stacking back on Route 22. He noted that traffic coming from I-81, going eastbound on Route 22 would exit before the Route 22 Bridge, and have a signalized intersection to make a left or right onto Route 22.

Mr. Rautzahn noted that Franklin Street and Route 22 would remain as it is today.

Mr. Crissman questioned if there would be one or two lanes for traffic entering I-83 northbound from Route 22. Mr. St. John noted that it would be one lane, but become a pick-up lane, adding the fourth lane to that area. Mr. Rautzahn noted that that area was recently changed to accommodate four lanes from the Valley Road bridge north.

Mr. Seeds questioned what would be done with the bridges that are to be replaced. Mr. Bachman explained that south of Route 22 is where the most significant residential impact occurs in the area of Revere Street. He explained that the east block of Revere Street was acquired when I-83 was built in the 1950's. He noted that it is a street with houses only on one side. He noted with the additional widening, there are five lanes on I-83 southbound, and it would place a retaining wall down the center of Revere Street. He noted that it has a 24-foot cart way, but people currently park on both sides of the street. He proposed to make Revere Street a single-lane northbound, fourteen feet in width. He noted that it would exclude parking on Revere Street. He noted that the southern block, south of Madison Street, the Interstate loses the fifth lane, and a 22-foot roadway could be constructed in this block and it could permit a parking lane, but the one-way restriction would remain. He noted that this would be a severe impact to the people who live on Revere Street. He noted that a neighborhood meeting would be scheduled with the people who live on Revere Street to review the impact to their properties. He suggested that three to four houses may have to be taken. He explained that there is an alley that abuts the rear of the homes and there are a number of parking spaces in the back. Mr. Seeds questioned if it is a private or public alley. Mr. Bachman noted that it was designated as a public right of way in the land development plan from the early 1900's. Mr. Crissman questioned what would happen to the other two homes on the other side. Mr. Bachman explained that they are close, but

he did not know what would be done with them. He noted that the alley would need to be reconstructed, and it may affect a few garages or outbuildings.

Mr. Bachman noted that there are three overpasses between Route 22 and Union Deposit Road; Locust Lane, Megoulas Boulevard, and Londonderry Road. He noted all three bridges would be replaced, and at Locust Lane and Londonderry Road, the roadway for I-83 would be raised to accommodate the 14.6-foot vertical clearance. He noted that he would provide space for full 12-foot lanes underneath the bridges, plus an appropriate shoulder and extra area for a sidewalk or extra larger shoulder. He noted that he would try to work with the Township to have that included in the project, or the Township may have to install the sidewalks.

Mr. Bachman noted that the intersection of I-83 and Union Deposit Road would remain a diamond interchange with a special treatment in the center which would bring the left turns to a single point in the middle of the interchange. He noted that one traffic signal would control all movements. He noted that it would allow the left turns on the ramps to go through the intersection and not have to stop at the next intersection at the next ramp. He noted that there would be two left turn lanes in all directions. He noted that there would be two right turn lanes from I-83 with the exception of the area in front of Lowe's. He noted that there would be signal control and a second lane would be added to Union Deposit Road. He noted that the primary widening to occur on Union Deposit Road would be from the double left turn lanes to the west, otherwise, it would remain two through lanes as it currently is. He noted that Briarsdale Road would have an added right turn lane built on the west side of the road which would help to line up the intersection with the Lowe's driveway.

Mr. Bachman noted that the big difference occurs to the east. He noted that the intersection of East Park Drive and Union Deposit Road would not work for the traffic projections for the year 2035. He noted that there is the added complication from the left turn into the M&T Bank area. He noted that this is the number one accident location for the Township at this time. He noted that he proposed to extend Avila Drive to Union Deposit Road and create a signalized intersection. He noted that traffic would provide better access to and from the Point Mall for Union Deposit Road. He noted that it would take some of the traffic impact from the intersection of East Park Drive and Union Deposit Road. He noted that the traffic signals would need to be coordinated very closely, and that it would prevent some of the traffic from traveling through Scenery Drive to access Londonderry Road. He noted that there would be three lanes for the east side of Union Deposit Road to help the flow for the intersections.

Mr. Rautzahn noted that over the winter months, they would revisit the footprint for the concepts, and complete an environmental analysis for the project. He noted that a public meeting would be held next spring, and he expects to receive the environmental clearances next summer, and secure funds through the TIP process. He requested the Board members to provide positive comments for the project to the Harrisburg Area Transportation Study (HATS).

Mr. Hornung questioned if there had been any consideration of the paving materials to be used to reduce the tire noise. Mr. Rautzahn noted that asphalt is more quiet than concrete, but he noted that there is a strong lean to use the new SUPERPAVE material, especially since there is no cure time for these materials. Mr. Hornung noted that road noise for that area is horrendous. Mr. Rautzahn noted that a full noise study would be completed and noise barriers would be installed. He noted that he would start to meet with the people in the neighborhoods that would be greatly impacted. He noted that there are also issues with the Franklin Street dilemma. Mr. Hornung questioned if the speed limit would remain 55 mph. Mr. Rautzahn noted that the area would be posted at 55 mph. He noted that, overall, the major footprint for the project is contained in the existing area for the interchanges except for the area north of Route 22.

Discussion with Barry Calhoun regarding various items affecting
South Central Emergency Medical Services

Mr. Wolfe noted that he attached the 2008 fiscal budget for South Central Emergency Medical Services (SCEMS), as well as the requested information from Mr. Calhoun for their additional living wage contribution request. He noted that Mr. Calhoun provided Board members with a living wage standard for SCEMS employees and explained that he would like to discuss the potential use of the Walnut Street garage as a new station for SCEMS in the Township.

Mr. Calhoun noted that the living wage request is a result of a major problem in the industry. He noted that people are not attending classes to become paramedics since the starting wage is only \$25,000, and for the last two years, only four medics graduated in Dauphin County. He noted that a survey conducted with five emergency medical service companies showed that they had 21 full-time positions open for over a two year period for medics, and as a result, SCEMS is using a considerable amount of overtime funds to schedule medics. He noted that there are three ambulances available for the Township, but for five days a month, the third ambulance was not available, and last month, there were nineteen days that the additional ambulance was not available.

Mr. Calhoun noted that the standard of living for the regional area that includes Virginia, Maryland and Delaware is \$32,000 for a starting wage for a paramedic and SCEMS's starting wage is only \$25,000. He noted that the regional average for an EMT is \$25,000 and SCEMS is \$18,000. He explained that he had an employee that joined SCEMS as a volunteer, trained to become an emergency medical technician (EMT), and took additional training to become a medic, and last month he left SCEMS to start a medic position in Maryland at the pay range of \$48,000. He noted that this is also true for the fire services as well.

Mr. Calhoun explained that he could reduce the availability of crews and ambulances that would reduce his budget, but people would die. He explained that he needs the funds to pay higher salaries. He noted that Medicare and Medicaid are a major problem, in that SCEMS only receives one-third of what it costs for services. He noted that the amount of Medicaid calls are increasing rapidly and amount to more than 50% of all calls. He noted that SCEMS received \$268,000 from the public from fund drives and membership programs. He explained that this amount seems to be increasing a little, since the overall range for service has increased. He noted that he cannot find people to hire to staff SCEMS at the current pay level, and that it is a state-wide problem. He noted that if he is able to raise the pay level, he could not guarantee his staffing level. He noted that he had budgeted training for two EMT's to attend medic school, but the training takes more than a year to complete. He noted that he had budgeted four people for the 2008 budget.

Mr. Hawk questioned how Mr. Calhoun arrived at the median rate of \$66,259. Mr. Calhoun answered that he received the information from a medical services journal, noting that it is a regional average. Mr. Hawk suggested that it is a little high for this area. Mr. Calhoun noted that his figures are based on the average of calls per municipality with the total amount of \$359,000. He noted that he based this on raising the salaries for all the personnel who were below the average, and anyone at the average, or higher, were raised \$1.75 per hour. He noted that medics spend a considerable amount in training, and for a medic who may spend 12 to 15 minutes at a cardiac arrest call, the average pay would be \$4.00 per hour.

Mr. Hawk questioned if Mr. Calhoun has made his presentation to the other municipalities and what has been their response. Mr. Calhoun answered that he did, and commented that they are trying to find the funds in their budgets. He noted that he has not met with Middletown group due to their budgeting cycle. He noted that he is currently making a profit from the services provided to the Highspire/Middletown, Royalton areas.

Mr. Hornung questioned what SCEMS's profit would be for this year. Ms. Stapf noted that it would be very close to break even. Mr. Hornung noted that last year's profit was close to \$200,000 due to grant funds. Ms. Stapf explained that SCEMS received an \$85,000 grant towards the purchase of an ambulance. She noted that the year before that, SCEMS had a deficit of \$125,000. She noted that there were administrative costs for the year 2006, noting that the staff level was down, but for 2007 the staff is back up to compliment. She noted that the 2006 losses had an impact on the 2007 budget.

Mr. Hornung questioned what would SCEMS do if the Township refused to consider the living wage compensations. Mr. Calhoun answered that he would continue to staff at the current level, but he would move to a basic life support (BLS) service for the ambulances without the medics and have the medics staff the supervisor's vehicles. He noted that this was how it was done in the 1980's. He explained that he would use more of the lower-paid employees for the basic life support. Mr. Hornung questioned if it would be more difficult to hire the BLS employees since they are paid a much lower wage. Mr. Calhoun noted that he employs more EMT's than medics, and uses many part-time employees to fill these positions.

Mr. Blain noted that the comparison for the two budgets shows the increased contributions from East, South, and West Hanover Townships that are very substantial. He questioned how Mr. Calhoun figured the additional needs for each municipality since, on a percentage basis; Lower Paxton Township is requested to provide 150% more in funds versus West Hanover who was asked to provide 100% more. Mr. Calhoun answered that he based it on the percentage of calls. He noted that in 2005, SCEMS responded to 28 municipalities in four counties, but for 2006, they responded to 37 municipalities in four counties. He noted that he has fewer crews, but the call volume is higher. He noted that 8% of the calls are for areas out of the coverage, excluding the City of Harrisburg, Susquehanna Township and Hershey. He noted that the collection rate is very bad, and the locations are not providing funds to come into their areas. He noted that when SCEMS is out of the area, then they are not available for the Township, and explained that one day last week, all three ambulances were responding to out of area calls. He explained that he has brought this situation to the attention of the Dauphin County Commissioners.

Mr. Blain questioned, if the Board provided the additional \$197,000 to SCEMS, what assurances would the Township have that SCEMS would not return next year with the same request. He questioned what Mr. Calhoun was doing to provide a five-year strategic plan for budgets, and explained that the Township has to provide the citizens with good budget planning,

and he does not take that responsibility lightly. He noted that the Township cannot afford to break the bank to support SCEMS and requested long-term information from SCEMS for future budget planning. He stated that this information should be supplied to each municipality for future budget planning. He further noted that it would behoove the Township to look for another service provider if the requests keep escalating at a high rate. Mr. Calhoun answered that he could provide this information on a percentage basis, but he did not know how many calls would occur in the future. He explained that SCEMS averages 200 to 300 calls each year. He noted that a major problem occurs when staff responds to a call, and no one is transported. He noted that he cannot force people go to the hospital, and stated that he could make projections for the future.

Mr. Hawk questioned how many employees work for SCEMS. Mr. Calhoun answered that of the 68 employees, 36 are full-time. Chief Bair questioned how many employees are required to provide service to Lower Paxton Township. Mr. Calhoun answered that all of them are. He noted that they rotate on a two-week cycle. Chief Bair questioned how many employees it takes to man the three crews for the Township. Mr. Calhoun answered that it takes 14 personnel each day to schedule the Township. Chief Bair questioned what percentage of that is the total. Mr. Calhoun noted that it would be roughly 28% of the personnel. Chief Bair noted that Lower Paxton Township has 60% of total calls, but only uses 28% of the personnel. Ms. Stapf explained that whenever one crew is busy, then another crew moves into the Township, and this continues to occur in order to maintain the staff level for all three crews for the Township. She explained that the Middletown crew would never move into the Township as a backup unit. Ms. Stapf noted that crews are only committed to Middletown and Lower Paxton Township.

Mr. Crissman noted that the estimate for the 2007 year budget is \$3,575,473, but he questioned what the actual figures were for the 2006 fiscal year. Mr. Calhoun answered that it was \$3,079, 817. Mr. Crissman questioned if there was a fund balance from that figure. Mr. Calhoun answered that it was \$200,000. Mr. Crissman questioned if the \$200,000 surplus was used to balance the 2007 year budget as there was an increase in roughly \$500,000 from the 2006 budget to the 2007 budget, and he explained that he was trying to ascertain the increase in the budget from year-to-year noting that there was a fund balance. He questioned if the increase request of 9% was for the increase in salaries only. He explained that he would like to see this explained on a spreadsheet. Mr. Calhoun explained that two pieces of equipment were purchased, "Life Pack 12" for advanced cardiac care, costing \$35,000 a piece.

Mr. Hornung questioned what was purchased using the \$4,000 for computer line item? Ms. Stapf answered that a new server and laptop with mapping software was purchased. Mr.

Hornung noted that Mr. Calhoun had cash flow mixed with accruals, and line items that do not belong where they are. Mr. Blain suggested that it would be better to have Ms. Stapf make the budget presentation as she seems to understand the numbers much better.

Mr. Calhoun explained that he did the budget last year while Ms. Stapf was doing the billing. He noted that this year will be different in that he has staff to do the billing and Ms. Stapf will do the budget. Mr. Blain questioned if all the municipalities paid the living wage request, would SCEMS be caught up in their budget. Ms. Stapf suggested that according to Mr. Calhoun's calculations, it would put SCEMS at the minimum grade where it could be competitive. She noted that it is a two-fold problem, the shortage of paramedics, and no amount of money would increase the shortfall. She noted that it would only help SCEMS to be competitive with the local services in the area to try to keep the personnel that are moving to Maryland. She explained that it would take care of the EMT problem, as it would raise the EMT salaries to better retain employees.

Ms. Stapf explained that the 911 system runs on two levels of care, the advanced life support provided by the paramedics and the basis life support provided by the EMT's. She noted that Medic 3 from Osteopathic Hospital provided medics, and SCEMS provide EMT's. She explained that due to shortage of medics, she is staffing the trucks with two EMTs and a paramedic is running a separate unit. She noted that 63% of the calls are for advance life support needing a paramedic, with the remaining only requiring the services of EMTs. She noted that the medics only respond when they are needed. She explained that the increase living wage requests for this year will move SCEMS to the minimum level to be competitive in the area. Mr. Blain questioned what would be the average and maximum salary levels for EMTs and what plan is proposed for salary increases for medical staff. He noted that reaching the minimum level does not solve the problem, noting that SCEMS need to retain it employees. Ms. Stapf answered that there is a minimum and maximum grade for salaries for EMTs, noting that the SCEMS Board uses this level every year. She noted that there had been a significant increase in the grade levels to make the opportunities more competitive, explaining that employees are eligible for an increase on an annual basis based on performance evaluations. She noted that the score for the evaluation is equivalent to a salary increase. She noted that the SCEMS Board also votes on this. She noted, in the past, the salary increase ranged from 3% to 6%, but, in the last four years it has been capped at 3%.

Mr. Crissman questioned if SCEMS has hired a professional service to review the positions and make recommendations for minimum and maximum salaries, noting that the range

would move based on cost of living and performance. Ms. Stapf answered that she already has this procedure in place, but has not had a separate entity review the procedures. She noted that she set this system up when she started ten years ago, and the Board reviews the wage scale each year. She noted that this discussion includes the cost of living increase, local competition, and what SCEMS can afford.

Mr. Crissman recommended that SCEMS should have a professional service assessment of what the positions are, what they should be paid, ranges for a series of steps, cost of living built in every year, along with performance objectives and salary. He noted that this is needed for long term budgeting purposes. He noted that the cost to have this done is minimal, but it is worth it.

Mr. Stapf noted that she was able to pay down the line of credit, but not for what was done in the past. Mr. Hornung questioned if the projected actual would be \$3,750. Ms. Stapf answered that it would not be as she would not be able to pay down what was expected.

Mr. Hawk questioned if similar proposals were made to the other municipalities. Mr. Calhoun explained that he sent a letter in August to each municipality explaining what their anticipated increase would be. Mr. Hornung questioned if the Township provided the additional funds, what guarantee would there be that it would go to salaries. Mr. Calhoun noted that he could show where the money goes and to what individuals. Mr. Hawk suggested that, across the board, the average salary is roughly \$23,900.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the 66% of the calls attributed to Lower Paxton Township included the Interstate calls. Mr. Calhoun noted that it would be included in the percentage, anything within the Township's boundaries.

Mr. Hornung noted that there is a need to raise the rates for the EMT and medics. He suggested if the Township were to provide more funds, he would like to see changes in the Board structure since the Township would want to have more control. He noted that SCEMS does need more funds, but it would not come without some strings attached. Mr. Calhoun suggested that he would need more expertise that he could contribute to the Board and that he needs someone actively involved in marketing, etc. Mr. Calhoun noted that the current contract with the Township needs to be changed. He noted that SCEMS's accountant also mentioned this to him. He noted that there are two types of positions on the SCEMS Board, appointees and elected officials. He noted that some of the people that were appointed are not attending the meetings. Mr. Hornung noted that he feels that the structure for the Board needs to change.

Mr. Calhoun noted that he needs more expertise in ways to bring in more money, such as running a capital campaign, endowment programs. He noted that he has received many grants funds noting that the EMS program is solely funded by grants. He noted that only 4% of the 911 funds went to ambulance service, and suggested that legislation has to change. He noted that it is a serious problem that is growing daily. He explained that he is not doing the best job that he could, and that is why he brought the information to the Board members attention.

Mr. Calhoun noted that he has purchased used vehicles and has saved over \$300,000 on four vehicles. He noted that he is trying to save funds as much as possible. He noted that in the last year he received 58% of the funds bills, and for this year it is 61%.

Mr. Blain noted that it is hard to swallow when Mr. Calhoun approached the Board to ask for \$190,000 in additional funds for what is already requested. He noted that he could understand a 5% or 10% increase, but when you ask for a 150% increase, it is a little much. He noted that he would need to review what other Township programs could be cut to accommodate this need. He noted that the Township needs to be a partner with SCEMS when this amount of funding is requested. He noted that he would like to see a strategic plan for the next five years for future planning.

Mr. Calhoun noted that he did not remember requesting an additional \$500,000 for last year's budget. Mr. Hawk noted that it was a substantial amount. Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Calhoun has discussed issues with salaries, but he needs a more definitive plan of action. Mr. Blain noted that if the supply of medics does not increase and the demand for their employment increases, then the salaries will escalate. He noted that he would like to see a business plan for the future needs and its impact on SCEMS, and how it would affect the local municipalities. Mr. Calhoun noted that he could project another five years of salaries. He noted that the problem is that he may have the money, but not the staff to pay. Mr. Crissman noted that salaries are the number one issue, and they should be built in. He noted that in order to run a successful business, you need a good salary plan that takes into consideration the local business situation.

Mr. Crissman noted that the Township in the year 2007, budgeted \$132,000, but Mr. Calhoun's 2008 budget only shows a request of \$128,000 from the Township. He questioned why he would not have used the same amount that was provided in 2007. Mr. Calhoun stated that the amount budgeted to SCEM was \$112,000. Mr. Crissman noted that the budget says that the anticipated amount is \$132,000. Ms. Stapf noted that she only received \$112,000 from the Township. Mr. Calhoun noted that that number was a proposed number. Ms. Stapf suggested that that document was prepared in the first quarter of 2007. Mr. Crissman noted that the anticipated

numbers are used to budget for the next year, and he questioned if the information was updated. Ms. Stapf noted that the updated copy was not presented to the Township. Mr. Crissman noted that the data in front of him is not good data. Mr. Calhoun noted that Mr. Seeds receives a copy of the monthly reports. Mr. Crissman noted that the monthly reports do not help him to build a budget for the next year.

Mr. Blain questioned what the most recent financial statements are. Ms. Stapf answered that August statements are the most recent. Mr. Blain questioned if he could meet with Ms. Stapf to discuss the months of actual reports to project the next four months activity, or wait until September's information is completed to show the third-quarter statement in order to project the last quarter spending. He noted that once this is done, he would like to see the budget numbers for 2008 listed next to the projected numbers to review. He requested Ms. Stapf to send him a copy of this once she has completed it, and he would take a look at it.

Mr. Calhoun questioned if the Board members wanted to discuss the Walnut Street garage request. It was noted since there were two more agenda items; it would be discussed at a later time.

Presentation by the Paxtonia and Colonial Park Fire Companies regarding equipment to be purchased in accordance with Phase III of the Fire Equipment Capital Plan

Director Bair noted that Chief Pierich, Linglestown Fire Company, has already received permission from the Board members to purchase his rig through the COSTARS program. In addition, Chief Lowman from Paxtonia Fire Company and Assistant Chief Swank from Colonial Park Fire Company are present to discuss the purchase of their rigs.

Chief Lowman explained that he submitted a set of specifications from one manufacturer in June of 2007. He noted that he received specifications from a second manufacturer, and noted that there was a price difference of roughly \$25,000 between the two manufacturers. He stated that he would prefer to use the same manufacturer that he used to purchase two other pieces of apparatus from. He noted that the price for the rig was \$456,000, with a second price of \$475,000. He noted that there are differences between the two manufacturers, noting that the current apparatus is all stainless steel. He noted that the first manufacturer would build the unit out of stainless steel, whereas, the second manufacturer primarily deals with an all-aluminum cab and box or an all-galvanized steel cab and box. He noted that they would build the cab out of aluminum, and the box out of stainless steel which is a minor problem, but should not create problems in the long run. He noted that the manufacturer with the higher costs also makes their own foam system. He noted that both units are basically the same as to how they are built.

Mr. Blain questioned if Chief Lowman chose the lower costing unit, but additional equipment would be needed, if it would raise the price of the unit. Chief Lowman noted that the price for both units was for the completed fire apparatus. He suggested that he could find a vendor who could build a cheaper product, but it would result in greater problems with the units.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the Township would have to use the lower priced unit. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Township would have to use the lowest responsible bid. Chief Lowman noted that he would like to purchase the unit through the COSTARS program. Chief Lowman noted that the vendor would submit the above quoted price to COSTARS to be put in the system. He noted that the invitation for bidders for COSTARS should be completed by this week, then the vendor could submit its proposals after the invitation is advertised for six weeks. He noted that once the six weeks are up, then it would be open for purchases.

Chief Lowman made a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors to go with the lower of the two bids through the COSTARS program. He noted that he would not be able to order the unit until December or January of 2008. Mr. Coburn suggested that you would not have to wait for the six week time period in order to bid on the apparatus. Mr. Wolfe suggested that COSTARS would be required to provide a period of time for bidders to respond to the specifications. Mr. Crissman suggested that there would be a certain period of time for the vendors to respond to the specifications. Chief Lowman suggested that some vendors are already posted on the COSTATS program, but Seagrave has not posted their apparatus yet.

Mr. Seeds noted that the Resolution that was passed approved the purchases for the three apparatuses from the Fire Equipment Capital Plan. Mr. Wolfe noted that the two fire chiefs need the concurrence of the Board members for the price of the equipment, and permission to purchase the items through the COSTARS program. Mr. Seeds noted that the Public Safety Committee has agreed with the proposed purchases, therefore the two chiefs should order their equipment.

Mr. Coburn noted that the Public Safety Committee requested Colonial Park Fire Company to look into purchasing a new rig, and he invited four manufacturers to provide prices. He noted that three of the four responded: KME, Pierce and E-1. He noted that KME meets the specifications for the Colonial Park Fire Company, and they will be posting their prices through the COSTARS program at a cost of \$500,000 to \$520,000. He noted that it would not be the actual cost of the vehicle since there is a rebate issued. He noted that the difference between the two fire company's rigs is due to CAFS system which costs roughly \$60,000. He noted that KME is an in-state manufacturer and a one-source manufacturer. He noted that Colonial Park

Fire Company owns two KME rigs and they are happy with the product and service. He requested to be able to purchase the rig from KME once it is posted on the COSTARS program. He suggested that there may be a double rebate possible, since the Linglestown Fire Company purchased their rig through the COSTARS program from KME.

Mr. Hornung questioned how much the rebate would be. Assistant Chief Swank answered that he did not know what it would be. Chief Pierich noted that he received a rebate when he purchased the tanker for Linglestown Fire Company, and if the Township purchases a second rig, there should be an additional rebate. Mr. Wolfe noted that the submission for the purchase orders would be weeks apart, but suggested that the rebate would still be available.

Assistant Chief Swank noted that since the manufacturer is only two hours away, members from his station could visit and check on the unit while it is being built. Mr. Coburn noted that he experienced a problem the last time they purchased a rig and that is why they specified a one-source manufacturer.

Director Bair noted that once the three new pieces of apparatus are received, then three pieces of apparatus will need to be sold. He noted that there are interested buyers for some of the equipment now, therefore, there should be some funds received from the sale of the old units to fund the purchase of the new ones. Assistant Chief Swank noted that after he orders his truck he would sell his unit as soon as possible.

Improvement Guarantees

Mr. Hawk noted that there were two improvement guarantees for consideration.

Sunnyhill Farms, North

A reduction and extension of a letter of credit with Mid Penn Bank in the amount of \$35,361.70 with an expiration date of October 9, 2008.

Wilshire Estates, Phase I

Establishment of a letter of credit with Fulton Bank in the amount of \$1,689,000 with an expiration date of October 9, 2008.

Mr. Blain made a motion to approve the two listed improvement guarantees as presented. Mr. Hornung seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and the improvement guarantees were unanimously approved.

“Otta Know” Presentation: Length of Service Awards for volunteer firefighters

Mr. Wolfe noted that on page four of the Length of Service information packet, the program is defined as a program that could provide emergency service organizations an incentive or benefit to be used in attracting new members. He noted that they are modified retirement programs providing monetary rewards tied to length of service as a volunteer fire fighter. He explained that some fire companies are able to provide Length of Service Awards Programs (LOSAP) using fire relief funds; however, legislation for this has not been enacted in this state. He noted that there is enabling legislation for a LOSAP, but he noted that he is not aware of any prohibition.

Mr. Wolfe noted on page six, LOSAP addresses nine questions, noting that the two big questions concern the retention of volunteers longer than five years, and the ability to be able to recruit new volunteers. He noted that the program would help to recruit and retain volunteers.

Mr. Wolfe noted, on the bottom of page seven, it states that a LOSAP works very similar to a pension plan, but on a much smaller scale with a plan affective date, entitlement age, a defined monthly benefit formula. He explained that there could be a pre-entitlement death benefit, vesting, and it could define the parameters by which it would consider an active volunteer for program purposes.

Mr. Wolfe noted on page eight, it provides the characteristics of a LOSAP, the benefits, such as a monthly income in the retirement years, noting that you set a year for retirement, and it could be monthly income for retirement years, noting that income could be based upon the number of years of active service. He noted that the plan could provide for a guaranteed number of years for entitlement, as well as a disability or death payment.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the firefighters are investigating the LOSAP programs, and a presentation was made by VFIS in regards to a specific program. He noted that Chief Cerzullo has also looked into other LOSAPs. Chief Cerzullo explained that there is no legislation in Pennsylvania to cover this; therefore the individual fire companies can set their own parameters. He noted that there are two different programs, one a define benefit program which has a specified income for each month, such a \$100 a month after reaching the age of 65. He noted that there is also a defined contribution plan which allows the Township to put a set amount of funds in a program, and at the end of the year, divide the funds proportionally among the members.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the fire fighters wanted the Board members to know that they are looking into LOSAP, and ultimately, they plan to come to the Township seeking funds for a program that would be a Lower Paxton Township Plan available to all fire fighters of active service as defined by the three Fire Companies. He noted that the cost for the program would be plus or minus \$50,000 a year. He noted that it could increase over time with inflation but it would not have to.

Chief Cerzullo noted that he was told to work with the amount of \$60,000 as a ball park figure, noting that each Fire Company would be granted \$20,000 to work with. He noted that a defined contribution plan could set a specific number and it could stay the same until the Township chooses to change the amount. He noted that it would not have to change, but a COLA for a certain percentage could be added. He noted that tax money from the community could be added to the amount. Mr. Seeds questioned if this would be funded through tax funds or the Firemen's relief funds. Chief Cerzullo answered that it would be Township funds. He noted that a defined benefit program would work within a certain amount of money.

Mr. Hornung questioned what it would amount to for an individual. Chief Cerzullo answered that the two different programs could provide a benefit of \$100 per month. He suggested that for a defined benefit program for 150 members, a \$100 pay out it would be \$60,000 per year, and it would reduce after ten year. He noted that he planned to provide previous credit for up to 15 years. He noted that a member would need to be in the program for 20 years to collect the \$100 per month, with five years vesting. He noted that he has 21 years with the Paxtonia Fire Company, and explained that he would receive credit for his previous 15 years, and he would need to be an active member for five more years and at age 65, he would receive \$100 per month. Mr. Seeds questioned if a person would receive more if he had more years of service. Chief Cerzullo noted that it could be set up that way, but at this time, it is not. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township could define the parameters. He noted that the defined contribution plan using previous time in service could be divided into increments, that if you were active for so many years, it would be put into an account until you reach the age of 65. At 65 years of age, you would be written a check, but between one and four years, a person could earn so many dollars for up to 20 years of service. He noted that it would also require a five-year vesting period. Mr. Seeds questioned if a person could contribute funds to it. Chief Cerzullo stated that this would not be the case. He noted that VIFS is not an insurance company. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township runs its own pension fund, and it would not need an outside firm to do this. Mr. Wolfe requested Chief Cerzullo to supply him with the information.

Mr. Wolfe explained that he did not want Chief Cerzullo researching this before informing the Board of his work, and asked if the Board would be interested in more information. Mr. Hawk noted that the Board agreed that this was beneficial for the firefighters. Chief Cerzullo questioned if this was to be implemented for the 2008 fiscal year budget, then the Township would need information for the budget. He suggested that \$60,000 would be a good amount to start some type of LOSAP for the fire volunteers. Mr. Hawk noted that the Board had discussed that amount at the last workshop meeting. Chief Cerzullo noted that it would provide the Township an amount to budget for in its first year of operation. He noted that there are two different plans, and one would benefit volunteers who have service more than those just entering the system.

Mr. Crissman questioned if anyone had talked with the members from Emmaus or Dover Fire Companies who are already using the plan. Chief Cerzullo answered that they were samples used by VFIS, but he explained that he looked into a plan from Maryland. He noted that Camp Hill Borough has a LOSAP plan and uses VFIS to run their program, but they have not returned his phone call. Chief Cerzullo noted that all the surrounding states have in-state legislation to cover this program and it sets 90% of the perimeters. He noted that in Pennsylvania, you could build a program any way you want to at this point. Mr. Hornung noted that it is important to make sure that the plan has the intended impact for the volunteers. Chief Cerzullo noted that the biggest impact is to recruit volunteers and keep them for more than five years. He suggested that it would be good to talk to other Townships who have plans to find out what works and what to avoid.

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 11:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman
Township Secretary