

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Board Meeting held June 24, 2008

An administrative workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6:06 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; Daniel Bair, Public Safety Director/Chief of Police; Sam Robbins, Public Works Director; and Brian Luetchford, Parks and Recreation Director.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Public Comment

No public comment was received.

BUSINESS

Discussion regarding the amount of the fee-in-lieu of recreation
dedication to be included in the SALDO

Mr. Luetchford noted that roughly a year ago, he came before the Board to discuss a survey that was completed of the park population per thousand for local municipalities. He noted that the survey showed that Derry and Hampton Townships have significantly more parks per population as compared to Swatara, Susquehanna, and Lower Paxton Townships. He noted that Derry and Hampton Townships have roughly the same amount of parkland but much less population. He noted that a discussion was held, at that time, as to how much parkland the Township should have. He noted that the National Parks and Recreation Standards suggest that since the Township is the largest community in Dauphin County, it would need to continue to add parkland in order to keep up with Derry and Hampton Townships.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the Parks and Recreation Board (PRB) put together a Recreation and Parks Open Space Plan, and he would like to discuss a portion of the plan that

concerns the fee-in-lieu of recreation dedication. He noted that an approved Parks and Recreation Plan is required by the Municipalities Planning Code (MPC), and information is needed for the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO) revisions.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the Parks and Recreation Plan identified a need for more parkland due to all the sports organizations that use Township parks. He noted that over 30 sports organizations use the Township parks as compared to six or eight for the local municipalities. He noted that staff has discussed increasing the amount of land to be dedicated per-dwelling-unit, and also considered a significant increase in the fee-in-lieu in order to be able to buy land at the current costs.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the Township currently requires 1,500 square feet, per lot, or \$2,300 per lot. He noted that staff proposed to increase the land requirement per lot to 1,861 square feet, and the fee-in-lieu to \$10,000 per lot or \$20,000 per acre. He noted that the Township needs to be able to afford to purchase land, and this may also persuade developers, who consistently provide a fee-in-lieu, to provide land. He noted that as the Township approaches build out, it is important to secure more land for parkland. He noted that he would strongly encourage developers to provide land in place of a fee-in-lieu.

Mr. Luetchford explained that the Township can no longer require developers to develop land that it dedicates for recreation. He noted that the MPC only permits the dedication of undeveloped land or the payment of a fee-in-lieu. He noted that the MPC does not support the requirement of the building of facilities, only raw land. He noted that Mr. Stine advised that an approved Parks and Recreation Plan could require the developer to provide land only.

Mr. Hornung questioned if a developer could provide for land somewhere other than in his development. Mr. Luetchford answered yes, but it must be in a reasonable location.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the Township identified a large parcel to purchase, and it floated a bond to pay for it, could the Township request the developers to purchase some of that land in exchange for what they would have to provide to the Township. Mr. Wolfe answered that a developer could only dedicate land or pay the fee-in-lieu. Mr. Luetchford noted that they could only provide the land if they own the land.

Mr. Hornung noted that when he joined the Board, the Township took land, but then it stopped taking land and it only wanted money. Mr. Luetchford noted that the Township did not have an approved plan for recreational parks, and there was a need for flexibility. He noted that that has changed with a plan that states that the Township needs land, and the MPC only requires

the donation of land, not the fee-in-lieu. He noted that the next philosophical change that occurred was that the Township did not want a lot of small parks, only large parks, so now it looks like there is a change in the policy to create smaller parks. Mr. Luetchford noted that Mr. Hornung's summary is somewhat correct; but he explained that any parcel two acres or less is still too small for parkland. He noted that the Township plan would include the right to determine if it wants the fee-in-lieu, as it would allow the Township to choose on a case-by-case basis. He noted that the Parks and Recreation Open Space Plan identifies a need for land, and if the Board members are in agreement with the plan, then the Township could require land donations. He noted that it is the Township's option to choose land over money. Mr. Crissman noted that the Township would want the option to be able to decline donations of land under two acres also.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Township does not have an option, as it has to take land donated to it. Mr. Wolfe noted that that is the current requirements, but if the new Parks and Recreation Plan would be adopted as part of the new SALDO, the Township would be able to have the option. He noted that the Township could not force developers to pay the fee, but if they are willing to dedicate land, and the Township does not accept the land, they could dedicate land to a Neighborhood Association. Mr. Hawk noted that it would depend on how large the land is.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the Township could force a developer to provide the fee-in-lieu. Mr. Hawk answered not at this time. Mr. Luetchford suggested that the Township should be able to do that under the new SALDO. Mr. Wolfe noted that he is not sure, and would have to get some clarification from Mr. Stine.

Mr. Luetchford quoted a provision from the MPC requiring the public dedication of land suitable for the use intended, and upon agreement with the applicant or developer, the construction of recreational facilities or payment of fees in lieu thereof. Mr. Seeds noted that both parties would have to agree to this. Mr. Hornung noted that if they don't agree, then the Township would have to take the land. Mr. Luetchford noted that the land must be acceptable to the Township. He noted that the developer could turn around and give the land to someone else if they can find an acceptable agreement. Mr. Hornung noted that the developer could give the land to a homeowners association and the Township would not get the fee-in-lieu.

Mr. Luetchford noted, if the developer provided the land to a neighborhood association, he would recommend that it does not fulfill a public park role; therefore, the Township would charge the developer 50% of the fee-in-lieu. Mr. Crissman noted that it appears that the

Township would have no clout at all and it really needs that. Mr. Luetchford noted that he would do more checking with Mr. Stine on this matter.

Mr. Seeds noted that the Township has a formula to determine its fee-in-lieu, and this would have to be changed.

Mr. Hawk suggested that changing the fee in-lieu from \$2,300 to \$10,000 would be sticker shock.

Mr. Hornung questioned what the surrounding Townships charge. Mr. Luetchford answered some are the estimated fair market value of unimproved residential land. Mr. Wolfe noted that this would require the developers to get an appraisal. Mr. Luetchford noted that Susquehanna Township charges \$2,500 per dwelling unit; Swatara Township charges \$1,500 per unit, and Newtown Township is over \$5,000 per dwelling unit. Mr. Hornung questioned what Derry Township charges. Mr. Luetchford noted that he did not have the price for Derry Township. Mr. Hornung questioned what it was for Hampton Township. Mr. Luetchford answered that it is \$1,000 per dwelling unit. Mr. Seeds suggested that Hampton Township may receive some of its funding from the Federal Government since they are located next to the Navy Depot.

Mr. Luetchford noted if a lot is made up of one half acre, with two lots per acre, and the price for an acre in the Township is roughly \$29,000 per acre, a few recommendations could be made for this plan. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would like the Board members to come up with a price that it feels comfortable with, but he suggested that \$2,300 is way too low. He noted, in the past three years, only three developments have dedicated land, and the last developer to do so was for Kings Crossing. He suggested that the Township is selling itself short and that it could get more per lot. He suggested that \$10,000 may be an unrealistic amount, with \$5,000 being more reasonable. Mr. Seeds noted that this would include raising the amount of land from 1,500 square feet to 1,861 square feet.

Mr. Hornung noted if the Township wants the land then it should have its fee-in-lieu close to \$10,000, because an acre of developed land is worth \$100,000. He noted that raising the fee-in-lieu to \$10,000 would cause some problems. Mr. Crissman noted that he had no problem with a \$5,000 fee-in-lieu. Mr. Hawk suggested that it could slow down building.

Mr. Luetchford questioned if an escalator clause would be included with the SALDO. Mr. Wolfe noted if the Township is looking to tie the value to assessed land, it could use the values provided by Dauphin County, and a formula could be placed into the fee-in-lieu using the

County assessment. Mr. Crissman suggested that the fee-in-lieu should be \$5,000, and building an escalator on the percentage of increase. Mr. Hawk noted that he liked that concept. Mr. Hornung noted that the fee could easily increase to \$7,000 to \$8,000, and suggested that it would be better to increase the fee over a course of time, and not within one year.

Mr. Wolfe noted that this would not affect anyone who has a preliminary approved plan.

Mr. Seeds noted if an acre of land is worth \$100,000, and the Township requires 1,500 square feet, it would be roughly 1/30th of an acre. He noted that 30 times \$2,300 equals \$69,000.

Mr. Blain questioned what would happen if the Board made the fee-in-lieu \$10,000. Mr. Hornung suggested that the Township would receive a lot of land. Mr. Blain noted that this is the intent, as the Township wants land more than it wants the money. Mr. Hornung noted that he was fine with that, but the Board must remember if it acquires land, it will be undeveloped land, and there is no use having undeveloped land if there are no funds to develop it. He noted to do this; the Board would need to raise taxes. Mr. Crissman questioned if it has to be determined if the Township must be forced to accept land or if it has an option to refuse certain land. He noted, if the fee-in-lieu is set too high, the developers might take the Township to court to force it to accept the land regardless of whether it wants it or not. He noted that the advantage to selling the land to CASA is that they would be responsible to develop and maintain the land. He noted that it costs roughly \$1,000 per-acre, per-year, to maintain parkland. He noted that the Board must also consider the costs to maintain the system of parks in the Township as there is no extra money in the budget to absorb these costs. He noted, if the Township receives land, then it must be prepared to develop and maintain the land, otherwise, it should not pursue purchasing land.

Mr. Wolfe noted if the Township wants to consider affordable housing, this discussion is contrary to the affordable housing concept as it would add additional development costs that would be passed on to people who can't afford it.

Mr. Luetchford noted, if the Township received a legal challenge for the fee-in-lieu, and the fee had no relationship at all to the land or improved land, then it would open up a level of discomfort. Mr. Blain questioned if it would be good to base the fee-in-lieu on 10% of the market value of the improved property, noting that a piece of property worth \$50,000 would have a fee-in-lieu of \$5,000. He noted that the fee-in-lieu would be formula driven and that would be harder to challenge in court. Mr. Wolfe noted that he liked this idea, but in some instances, an appraisal would be needed. He noted that Fine Line Homes does not sell land, it is

packaged as one deal, and the cost for the lot is an unknown, but in most instances a formula driven fee would work.

Mr. Blain questioned if the value of land would be the same for a half acre of land with sewer and water regardless of where it was located. Mr. Wolfe answered that a half acre of land with improvements in the Estates of Forest Hills has a higher value than in the Huntleigh development due to location. Mr. Hornung suggested that zoning could have an impact too.

Mr. Blain questioned if the strategy for the PRB was to build large regional parks and not build smaller parks. Mr. Luetchford answered that the PRB always wanted to build large parks, but questioned if it was better for the Township to consider getting whatever land it could since it is facing the build out of land in the Township. He questioned if anything less than ten acres of ground should be accepted, or whatever amount the Board chooses to use. He noted that the current plan states that it would not accept land less than two acres.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there are some answers to questions that Mr. Luetchford needs to provide back to the Board members, and he was only looking to discuss this issue with the Board members to receive their thoughts for this topic.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the PRB was looking to develop smaller regional parks. Mr. Luetchford answered the PRB is willing to accept them more so at this point because of the limitation on land. Mr. Hawk noted that he grew up in a community that had neighborhood schools, and he suggested that people are more prone to go to a local park without having to drive half way across the Township to get there. Mr. Hornung agreed, but if the philosophy is changing, he would like to know if the PRB has reviewed the problems, of policing smaller parks, and maintenance issues. He noted that it is much easier to police a larger park. He noted that if there is a change to be made; he would want to revisit the thought process for smaller parks. Mr. Luetchford noted that the PRB still continues to recommend that the Township should combine pieces of land or search for large parcels of land to develop. He acknowledged that the maintenance for small regional parks would cost more, and this is a concern. He noted that the PRB's belief is due to the limited amount of land available, the Township should accept what land it can, and develop an interest in five-acre and ten-acre parcels.

Mr. Seeds noted that the fee-in-lieu needs to be raised, explaining that the funds are being spent for repairs and replacement in the existing parks. He noted that the fee-in-lieu funds should only be used for the purchase of additional facilities. He noted that the Township did not want to raise taxes to further fund the parks system, and the Township has been using the fee-in-

lieu funds to maintain what it already has. He noted that the Township would never have enough funds to cover the parks expenditures unless it would float a bond, or raise taxes to dedicate money to the parks. Mr. Hornung noted that the Township has used a lot of the fee-in-lieu funds in the building and development of George Park. Mr. Hornung noted that the fee-in-lieu funds do not come close to what the Township has invested in George Park. He noted that the Township has far outspent the fee-in-lieu funds in the development of parks. Mr. Seeds noted that it has not solely been used for the purchase of new parks. Mr. Luetchford noted that the upgrades to some parks came from the fee-in-lieu funds. Mr. Hornung noted that the Township has used a huge amount of Township funds to develop George Park. Mr. Wolfe explained that if the fee-in-lieu funds are not spent within three years, they must be given back to the developer. He noted if the fee-in-lieu funds are spent now, to keep the Township funds for use later, then the Township would not lose any money.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the Board agreed with the PRB concept to develop smaller parks. He noted that Mr. Luetchford must inquire with Mr. Stine to find out if the Township must accept the fee-in-lieu. He questioned if the \$10,000 rate for fee-in-lieu was too high, and suggested that the \$5,000 rate would be more comparable to other municipalities. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would not hurt to get more information from other municipalities.

Mr. Hornung explained that Mr. Hoffer made his money from taking buildings that were only 80% used, and raising the usage to 90%. He questioned if the existing land is used to the max, and used efficiently. Mr. Wolfe noted that the fields are worn as they are used very hard. Mr. Hornung questioned if more fields could be packed into the existing land. Mr. Wolfe noted that there are issues for parking at Koons and Brightbill Parks, noting that there is not sufficient parking to accommodate more use, but suggested that the PRB could review this issue. He noted that Mr. Luetchford would be coming back to the Board in regards to a dog park, noting that if it is placed in a park that has underutilized space, noting that there is very little underutilized space in the parks, then accommodations would be needed for additional parking.

Presentation of and status report on the Police Department 2008 Business Plan

Chief Bair explained that it was decided that the Police Department would be more goal oriented in determining what services to provide to the community rather than reactionary as situations developed. He determined that each division would come up with three goals, and each Division Commander would have to review the needs and expectations of the community, the

Police Department, and the divisions within the Department, to determine what needs should be met and create the goals from that information.

Chief Bair noted that in order to insure buy-in from the Lieutenants, he developed a new performance plan for the Lieutenants that is based on their ability to determine goals and meet their expected outcomes. He noted that he would provide a status report for each goal to date.

Chief Bair noted that the first goal was to reduce the probability that sexual offenders that reside or work in the Township would commit repeat offenses. He explained that the first objective was to improve the Department's ability to monitor sex offenders and sexual predators. He noted that the action plan was to review the current procedures and implement procedural changes, and this was completed by April 30, 2008. He noted that the second action plan was to create a data base for sexual offenders, and this was completed by May 1, 2008. He noted that that database is accessible from inside the office or by the officers in the patrol vehicles. He noted that the database includes the information on the sexual offenders as well as a photograph. He noted that the third action plan was to utilize the database for monitoring sex offenders and investigating sex crimes. He noted that the work address or home address for the sexual offenders is plotted on a Township map, and this map is revised and available for officers on a monthly basis. He stated that he hopes to have the map available in the police vehicles by the end of the year.

Mr. Hornung questioned how many sex offenders live or work in the Township. Chief Bair answered that 56 offenders live or work in the Township. Mr. Hornung questioned how many sex crimes are reported. Chief Bair answered that there have been 20 to 30 crimes reported to date for the year. Mr. Crissman questioned how this number compared to other municipalities. Chief Bair suggested that it would be a standard number, but suggested that a higher concentration of sex crimes would be reported in the City of Harrisburg. Chief Bair noted that he did not know how it would compare to the surrounding municipalities. He noted that roughly one-third of the listed sex offender's work in the Township.

Mr. Wolfe questioned if the businesses in the 3900 block of Route 22 have any impact on those numbers. Chief Bair noted that he could not remember reading any reports where a sex offender was an employee of Adult World. Mr. Wolfe questioned if a person is arrested for prostitution would he be considered a sex offender. Chief Bair answered no, but explained that if they are a purveyor of the prostitution and the prostitute is under 18, then they would be.

Chief Bair explained that the second goal was to reduce the number of juvenile cases referred to Dauphin County Court and Probation by expanding the in-house juvenile program. He noted that the main in-house juvenile program is Juvenile Alternative Sentencing Program (JASP). He noted that the referrals to the JASP have increased by 157%, from 7 juveniles in 2007 to 18 juveniles in 2008. He noted that the Department reduced the number of juveniles referred to Dauphin County Juvenile Probation from 139 in 2007 to 99 in 2008.

Mr. Crissman noted that the number of referrals to the Schaffner Center is down this year from last year. He noted that this is the first time in five years that this has occurred.

Chief Bair noted that the third goal for the Field Services Division was to improve the efficiency and management of criminal investigation cases assigned to the criminal investigation unit. He noted that this involves the actual handling of cases once one is assigned to a criminal investigator. He noted that an investigation time-frame has been created. He explained that within two days of the case assignment, the detective must contact the victim to identify themselves and seek additional information. He noted that within 15-days, the detective must submit his first supplemental report, and after 30-days, a second supplemental report must be submitted. He explained that after 45-days, the detective will meet with the detective sergeant, to determine to close the case due to the lack of leads, or request an extension to continue the investigation. He noted that this procedure would track all of the cases, and bring each case to closure. Mr. Hawk questioned if the victims are notified of the status of the case. Chief Bair answered that the victim would be notified of the status of a case. Chief Bair explained that he was seeking a 75% compliance rate for this goal and as of June 22, the compliance rate was 80%, and he hoped to attain the goal of 90%.

Chief Bair explained that the fourth goal was to improve community satisfaction with the services that are provided by the Police Department. He noted that the objective was to evaluate the current level of satisfaction with police services and determine future community needs. He noted that in 2003, the Police Department conducted a survey of the residents in the Township, and currently the Department is conducting a second survey of the community. He noted that a survey would be mailed to all residents with their sewer bills, and would also be available on-line to download and complete. He noted that he hopes to have the survey results by September 30, 2008.

Chief Bair noted that the second action plan was to increase the number of citizen feedback forms conducted per each unit by 10%. He noted that on a monthly basis, each sergeant

is tasked to survey complaints, requesting feedback in regards to how the initial patrol officer handled the call, what was his response time, and was he courteous. He noted that the detective sergeant also completes home surveys as well. He noted that the surveys are completed by phone or by making a visit to the home. He noted that he hopes to increase the number of contacts made by each supervisor and create a database to make the information more readily available to the Lieutenants and Sergeants to identify officers that may need more training in their work.

Chief Bair noted that the Community Policing Unit, along with Lt. Johnson, were successful in receiving the Department's Reaccreditation and this would be presented to the Department at the Pennsylvania Chief's of Police meeting held in July. Mr. Crissman noted that an article in the Township's newsletter should be completed regarding this. Chief Bair noted that the review process found no problems with the policies, and the reviewers only requested a few additional proofs for the process.

Chief Bair noted that the fifth goal concerned making the Township roadways safer for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians. He noted that each officer assigned to the Traffic Safety Unit is expected to have one contact per hour and that contact may include written warnings or traffic citations. He noted that the current count for contacts is 7.99 contacts per an eight hour shift. Mr. Seeds asked if this could be considered a quota system. Chief Bair answered that it could not as he is not specifically ordering an officer to issue a specific amount of citations.

Chief Bair noted that the second objective was to reduce the number of injury traffic accidents that occur on Township and state roads. He noted that the increase in enforcement has shown a reduction in the number of traffic accidents investigated by officers. He noted that officers are to meet the traffic enforcement standards index of between 1.35 to 1.40 reportable accidents to moving citations ratio. He noted that the Department is at 1.74 accidents for every 74 citations issued. He noted that although the Township had two recent fatal accidents, the number of injury accidents had decreased for the past seven years, and it had been three or four years since the Township had a fatal accident. He explained that 25 officers have been trained to operate a hand-held speeding device.

Chief Bair noted that the sixth goal was to provide for safer communities by identifying high crime areas and committing the resources and solution to mitigate the problems. He noted that The Brook Apartment Complex has been identified as an area, based on its size and population, as having a high ratio of Part I and Part II crimes. He noted that this is the primary target area, and the goal was to decrease the reports of crime by 10% at that location. He noted

that to date, the Part I crimes have been decreased by 12% and the Part II crimes by 21%. He noted that the overall calls for service have been reduced by 20%. He noted that there is a plan in place for activities for the officers to be involved in, and the statistics are a direct result of that plan.

Mr. Seeds questioned if The Brook Apartments have more complaints than the Pennswood Apartments. Chief Bair answered yes, and more significant crimes. Chief Bair suggested that there is a high percentage of Section 8 housing at The Brook Apartments, and it has created many problems.

Chief Bair noted that the second objective was to increase visible, approachable, and proactive patrol methods in targeted locations. He noted that he wanted to fully outfit all currently trained bicycle officers, and train one additional officer. He noted that bicycle patrol has a high impact in communities, providing better community relations, and also providing a greater percentage of coming upon a scene of a crime as it occurs. He noted that to date, the deployment rate has increase by 325%.

Chief Bair noted that the final goal was to establish a uniform procedure to demonstrate respect and honor of Department members at memorial and funeral services for active and retired officers, Department members, and their family members. He noted that this would establish a procedure for what should be done if an officer dies while on duty or after they retire. He noted that it would set a procedure for the response of the Department's Honor Guard.

Mr. Seeds noted that last year, there was a huge funeral in Linglestown for the young fire-fighter who died in a car accident. He noted that some of the officers complained that there was no policy in place to cover these types of issues. He noted that the motorcycle officers led the procession to the cemetery in Duncannon. Mr. Seeds noted that there should be procedures for any type of dignitary in the community, as well as firefighters. Chief Bair noted that Chief Lowman requested the motorcycle escort to the cemetery, and he authorized the escort. He noted that this policy is only for police officers, in active duty, off-duty, or retired from duty. He stated that the Department has procedures for funeral detail escorts inside and outside the Township.

Chief Bair noted that there are no current procedures to cover what to do if a police officer would die while on duty, who should be notified, who responds to the hospital, or to the home. He noted that these procedures need to be made into policy.

Mr. Seeds questioned what was meant by the Department's eleven highest risk policies found on page 12. Chief Bair answered that there are more than 80 Administrative and Operations Policies, and staff has identified the 11 policies that cover the highest risk incidents, such as vehicle pursuits, or use of force. He noted that it covers those instances where officer safety is involved and liability to the Township is involved. He noted that the policies were prioritized and it was decided to provide increased training for the top eleven policies. Chief Bair explained that he choose those eleven policies for additional training.

Mr. Hawk noted that it was a comprehensive plan and explanation. Chief Bair noted that the Department is on-goal for all the objectives.

Discussion regarding the initial efforts to develop a pavement management program

Mr. Robbins noted that the Board members should have a memorandum dated April 11, 2007 that discussed the development of a Pavement Management Program (PMP). He explained that a key component for a PMP is a spreadsheet to add the data to. He noted that he secured PENNDOT's District-8 Spreadsheet for the Liquid Fuels Allocation, and removed information that did not pertain to the PMP. He noted that he reduced the spreadsheet to include the street name, route number, segment number (PENNDOT), and the beginning and ending terminus for a section of a roadway. He explained that Prince Street could have seven segments for the entire street, which would be from one intersection to the next intersection. He noted that it is important because a pavement segment can vary from one intersection to the next as one segment could require a different type of maintenance from the next segment.

Mr. Robbins noted that the spreadsheet also includes the right-of-way width, noting that he is in the process of building that data as he moves along with the process. He explained that he is utilizing the spreadsheet by taking data that has been incorporated into the road network, such as crack sealing, full depth reclamation, and other things that the Public Works Department has done, as well as work done prior to his starting with the Township in 2004, to be used as a tool to establish what was done with the road network for that period of time.

Mr. Robbins noted that he needs to use the spreadsheet to acquire data from the field and enter the information into a computer program in order to analyze what needs to be done at a given road segment.

Mr. Robbins noted that there are many PMP's available, and all use a spreadsheet to provide a database. He noted that he would not have to pay a company to generate the spreadsheet since it has been completed. He noted that the Township's GIS program is very

beneficial as well. He noted that these are two bits of data that are very useful for establishing a PMP. He noted that there are many types of PMP, but they all require data input, which is a huge part of the puzzle. He noted that how the data is inputted into the program is the most important component as the data must be efficient and consistent.

Mr. Robbins explained if he provided each Department member with a sheet and asked them to evaluate the same street; they could provide five different opinions, therefore, when the data was compiled it would be very subjective.

Mr. Robbins explained that last year he attended a conference in San Antonio, and many of the top Pavement Management vendors were present. He explained that he reviewed numerous programs, noting that they all do the same thing, but the key is how the data is collected and entered into the spreadsheet, and how user friendly the end product is.

Mr. Robbins noted that E-Road Info is the Company that he keeps coming back to for a PMP because they have an automated field survey that is completed by a vehicle that measures the cracks, and many parameters for the pavement, and that information is downloaded into a program. He noted that all the information is jelled together, and he could prioritize what roads need to be crack-sealed or overlaid by road segments. He noted that he could notify the different utilities in advance to inform them of upcoming work and their need to make their updates prior to his road work.

Mr. Robbins noted that a PMP is critical since it would allow the Township to take funds that it allocates for paving and stretch those funds to provide a mechanism to insure that the money is being spent in the best manor possible. He noted that it is important to work on roads that are 75% intact, to provide the right treatment and protect the road before it gets to a point where the cost quadruples.

Mr. Robbins noted that when he started to work for the Township in 2004, the AC Index which is what drives the cost of asphalt, was \$210, which equated to \$27 a ton for blacktop, now it is \$552, which amounts to \$62 a ton for blacktop.

Mr. Robbins explained that he would like to have E-Road Info make a presentation to the Board members. He noted that their work speaks for itself, and he admitted that it is expensive. He explained that he could have people walk each segment of every road, and complete a data sheet, enter the information into the computer, but the part that he is concerned with is the consistency of the information for the condition of the road. Mr. Crissman suggested that a machine would be consistent.

Mr. Robbins noted that he spoke with Mr. Layman from the Department of General Services (DGS) and reported that PENNDOT did a PMP with interns, paid someone to input the data and they found that there were such huge inconsistencies in the data, that they now use two vehicles that are equipped with the technology to do the review. Mr. Hornung questioned if you could rent the equipment. Mr. Robbins noted that it would be too sophisticated a piece of equipment to operate. He noted that E-Road Info has two vehicles that they use. Mr. Hornung questioned if they would complete the survey for the Township. Mr. Robbins answered that they would perform the services. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it would be very similar to televising the sewer lines, categorizing, surveying, and documenting the information.

Mr. Crissman questioned how often this would have to be done. Mr. Robbins suggested that it should be done every two to three years, but he talked to four municipalities who have E-Road Info services, and two repeat the survey on a three-year basis, while the other two do it every five years. He explained that when the surveys are repeated, they would not survey the roads that have been completed since that data was entered into the computer. He noted that the costs the second time around would not be as expensive, noting that the first time costs would also include the licensing for the data, and initial setup. He noted that Baltimore, Maryland has 641 lane miles of road and they do their surveys on a five-year basis, and the cost for the last one was \$3500. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township has over 400 miles.

Mr. Hawk noted that there are nine segments for Arlington Avenue. Mr. Robbins explained that each segment may require a different process for maintenance. He noted that North Houcks Road's southbound lane has sections of roadway that there are cracks in the road, but the northbound lane is in much better shape. Mr. Wolfe noted that when asphalt was cheaper, the solution would have been to pave the road, but at \$60 plus a ton, it triples the cost of paving.

Mr. Seeds questioned what the CR meant on the spread sheet. Mr. Robbins explained that it meant' crack seal, and SL stands for seal coat, Micro stands for micro surface, overlay and reconstruction. He noted that a micro surface was placed on Fairmont Drive as it had a high Skid Resistant Level (SRL) and was used to prevent accidents. He noted that each application has a critical timeframe for the application to be efficient and effective.

Mr. Blain noted that Mr. Robbins would like to hire the vendor to survey the roads. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would like to have the vendor come to make a presentation to the Board members. Mr. Blain noted that part of the strategic plan was to identify what needs to be done with the road system over the next ten years. He noted that this would require an inventory of the

road system to include the condition for each road. He noted that in order to do this, Mr. Robbins would like the Board members to have E-Road Info make a presentation to better explain how its system would maintain the roads and provide for a better analysis of the use of funds for the next five to ten years. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would try to schedule the company for the next Board meeting. Mr. Blain agreed that he would welcome the presentation. Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Robbins would need to include this in his 2009 budget. Mr. Blain noted that it is important to maintain the roads the best it can to provide for a long life for the road, and it would save the Township funds.

Mr. Robbins noted if the Township takes a road, such as Prince Street, and crack seals it like it did last year, then four to six years after that, a curbside mill and overlay could be done, and this would provide for another ten to twelve years of service. He noted that it would be more expensive to complete full depth reclamation for the road.

Mr. Seeds questioned what type of surface is used for a micro surface. Mr. Robbins explained that it is a slurry material, noting that the Micro Surface B provides for a better skid resistance level as it contains an aggregate. Mr. Wolfe noted that these products have grown from what was originally called tar and chip. He noted that the Township has never used a tar and chip product, and explained that they are much more advanced in its technology. He noted that as the road condition grows more toward failure, the cost to fix it increases significantly. He noted that the Township did a lot of crack sealing work last year, and it provided a huge benefit.

Mr. Robbins noted that Fairmont Drive was micro-surfaced in 2007 from Barley Corn Square to Clover Road, and from Timothy Road to Clover Road.

Mr. Hawk thanked Mr. Robbins for his report.

Review of capital projects identified in the Strategic Plan

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would like to briefly discuss the 2007 Strategic Plan in anticipation of an upcoming administrative workshop meeting to focus entirely on a reevaluation of the current plan.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the strategic plan is a much larger document than the one page spreadsheet. He noted that the critical component parts on issues that need to be addressed are found on the sheet. He noted in the year 2007, the Board identified and categorized the needs and issues, listing the top priority issues in blue. He explained that all of the projects are currently active, and he listed their current status: George Park has final phases to complete in 2008

through 2010; Linglestown Square Project should start in 2009; Implementation of the second consent decree and Act 537 Plan is pending; New marketing plan has been developed for the Friendship Center; Three-year 2006 Vision Plan for the Police Department will be completed in 2008; and the Conway Road Landfill Relocation is in process too.

Mr. Wolfe noted that for the second tier projects, the Nyes Road Corridor Project has moved along rapidly with PENNDOT's construction to start in 2009, but no action has been taken on the fire services study or the strategic plan for South Central Emergency Medical Services. He noted that the staffing plan for the Public Works Department has begun through the development of a strategic plan, and the Board members just completed a discussion on the PMP plan. He noted that projects in the Comprehensive Plan are listed on the bottom of page two. He explained that the new zoning ordinance was adopted in July 2006; staff is 80% completed with the Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance (SALDO), and the Greenway Plan was adopted in March 2008.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the bid for Municipal Solid Waste Collection and leaf waste has been completed, but no discussion has been held in regards to charging for the use of the Compost Facility by licensed contractors.

Mr. Wolfe noted that staff's attempt to hire a staff engineer was unsuccessful.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the pink section includes the installation of new traffic signals, noting that the last traffic signal installed was at Patton and Linglestown Roads. He noted that improvements to the Lockwillow Avenue and North Mountain Road signal in line with development that will occur on the northwest corner are pending. He noted that the Township received funds to install a traffic signal at Commons Drive and Devonshire Road, and PENNDOT is installing a traffic signal at Nyes Road and Locust Lane.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the technology enhancements for the Township's annual budget were presented as its own budget category. He noted that the comprehensive mini-basin improvement projects for the sanitary sewer program are in process. He noted that discussions with Capital Area Soccer Association (CASA) for the purchase of the Wolfersberger Tract are in process, and the development of a dog park is now under discussion. He noted that the Township has not taken any action in regards to the analysis of a need to expand the Public Works Building or the funding of the GASB 45 liability to fund the post retirement medical benefits for police officers.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there have been new issues or needs added since this plan was originally adopted. He noted that the Level of Service Award Program (LOSAP) for firefighters is being implemented this year. He noted that the Township continues to oppose the Department of Environmental Protection's implementation of the Paxton Creek TMDL, noting that some type of determination from the Environmental Protection Agency is expected at the end of this month which may require further legal action. He noted that the development of a Skate Park in George Park is ongoing with the Freedom Group. He noted that the Capital Region Council of Governments is continuing the negotiation of a franchise agreement with Verizon. He noted that Phase III of the Fire Equipment Capital Fund was completed this year as three units have been ordered, and two pieces of apparatus have been received.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board had discussed the implementation of a lock box system for real estate tax collection and the preparation of a re-development plan for the Paxtonia area. He noted that the Township is actively working on the restructuring of the Capital Tax Collection Bureau (CTCB).

Mr. Wolfe noted that the list shows the current status of projects and the addition of the new identified needs and issues. He suggested that an administrative workshop should be scheduled with Department heads to start a brainstorming session to ensure there is a complete list. He noted that the Board could then reprioritize the needs and issues as this could be done as part of the initial preparation of the 2009 budget.

Mr. Hawk noted that he spoke to Ms. Bair and she is receptive to the lock box program. He noted that he attended a presentation by Fulton Bank and the Central Dauphin School District changed their collection to a lock box system using the Berkheimer Group. Mr. Wolfe explained that Ms. Creason was to research this for the County level, but nothing has happened to date. Mr. Hawk noted that he spoke to Ms. Creason and he felt that the County was dragging their feet on this. He suggested that the Board should move forward with it.

Mr. Hawk noted that there was a large article on the Business Improvement Districts (BID) in the past weekend's Patriot-News. Mr. Seeds noted that the Board asked the Planning Commission to take a look at BID's, and they selected Route 22 from I-83 to Mountain Road as the area for review. He noted that they are looking at Route 22 instead of reviewing the Paxtonia area. Mr. Seeds suggested that Mr. Wolfe should have Ms. Wissler tell the Planning Commission that they are not on the same page as the Board. He noted that some of the comments made by the Planning Commission stated that the Walnut Street Corridor only had to do with the

highway, and it did not. He noted that the study also included the future of business, and more than just the pavements. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board would be conducting a joint meeting with the Planning Commission in the near future to finish the SALDO, and it could be discussed with them at that time.

Mr. Seeds noted that the Board has met many of the issues and concerns that are on the list.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there is nothing significant that has happened with any of the items that the Board members do not know about that would adversely impact the current budget or the 2009 budget. He noted if PENNDOT follows through on the Nyes Road project and includes the traffic signal for Locust Lane and Nyes Road, the Township may save a lot of money as it had budgeted an initial cost of \$200,000, expecting to contribute up to \$2 million, but at this point the Township may only have to pay for the engineering design costs of \$30,000. He noted that this is all unofficial at this time.

There being no further business, Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Blain seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 7:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman
Township Secretary