

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop April 8, 2014

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

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

Also in attendance was George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steve Stine, Township Attorney; Larry Arnold, Appalachia Technologies; Tom Stang, Waste Management; Steve Fleming, HRG; John Hewlett, Susquehanna Group Advisors; Sam Robbins, Public Works Department; Brian Luetchford, Parks and Recreation Director; and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

**Pledge of Allegiance**

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

**Public Comment**

Ms. Sybil Peachlum, Apartment C-22, 4131 Spring Valley Road, explained that she has been in touch with police officers and the management of the apartment complex where she lives. She explained that there is a noise that has been going on in her apartment and no one seems to do anything about it. She noted that she contacted the property manager after the very first incident on March 5, 2014 when she informed them that there was some kind of god-awful noise invading her apartment. She noted it was the first letter that she sent. She explained that she received no response from the apartment complex as they responded very briefly. She noted that the regional manager sent her a letter stating that noise is very important to them. She noted that the apartment website states that it is a quiet and peaceful community and they also hand out brochures to that fact.

Ms. Peachlum stated that she had lived there for almost three years and the noise started within the last month. She explained that they finally responded on March 28<sup>th</sup>, three weeks later. She noted that she sent another letter on March 30<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Peachlum noted on April 5<sup>th</sup> a loud noise shook her wall and apartment and it was so loud that she ran out of her apartment and ran to the police department. She noted that the police

officer told her that there is nothing that the police can do as there is no noise ordinance in the Township. He suggested to Ms. Peachlum that she should attend the Township meetings to see if she could make any headway there. She noted that is why she is present at this meeting.

Ms. Peachlum noted that there has been no response from Spring Valley Apartments about the noise.

Ms. Peachlum noted that she went to the Zoning Department and spoke with Amanda Mitchell, the Codes Enforcement Officer for the Township, and presented to her some things that were in the apartment that the apartment complex was not addressing. She noted when you take a shower, if someone flushes the toilet, the water gets really hot and then it gets ice cold once the toilet fills up. She noted that there were other issues and management did an excellent job for many of the issues but there are two remaining issues that were not addressed. She noted the one issue is that the walls are shaking. She noted that she told management that she felt that it was a structural issue and she shouldn't hear it in her apartment. She noted that she presented this to the Code Enforcement Officer and it was determined that the noise in the wall was not structural and because of that Ms. Peachlum would have to pay a \$300 appeal fee which she can't do as she is only a tenant living in her apartment.

Ms. Peachlum noted that she contacted Mr. Wolfe, sent him two emails that were not answered. She noted in the email she indicated that nothing should be able to disturb her in her apartment like that. She stated that the crux of the issue is structural and she noted in her correspondence that Spring Valley found no issues in regards to the shower, as they did not detect anything. Ms. Peachlum noted that she sent Mr. Wolfe an email and asked him to respond to the Codes requirement for what the requirements are for an apartment building when it is erected and if the studs were spaced correctly in the walls. She asked if he would be willing to come to the apartment and take measurements regarding that and she received no response from Mr. Wolfe.

Ms. Peachlum noted that she sent a second email that the noise was actually coming not from only C-21 which is next to her, but the noise was also coming up from the office. She noted that she can't prove it and as long as she can't prove it they will not stop making the noise. She suggested that the noise has been planted into the wall. She noted that there is another tenant that lives there and he told her that he has noise in his walls. She noted when the police come they listen at the door and they can't hear anything at the door as the noise is in the wall.

Mr. Hornung questioned what the noise sounds like. Ms. Peachlum responded, du, du, du, du, du. She noted that it is like torture and when they turn it down lower, it is worse. She noted that they can turn it up or down. She explained that she contacted a contractor and asked him if he could tear the wall out but he stated that it would cost \$600. She noted that she is just a tenant trying to live in the apartment, noting that she has lived there for two years, but in the last month, this du, du, du, du, noise has been going on.

Mr. Hawk questioned if it was just in her apartment. Ms. Peachlum answered that she does not know if it is throughout the entire complex. She explained that she talked to another gentleman who lives right downstairs from her and he is adjacent to that apartment, so she does not know if that noise is coming into his apartment from that apartment. She noted it is not just that apartment it was also coming up from the wall connected to the office; it is all in the same building.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if it sounds like a boom box. Ms. Peachlum answered no; it is more like a rumble. She noted if you have heard an airplane fly through the air and once it leaves the area that you are in, you hear a reverberation, it sounds like that. She noted that it is nerve racking.

Mr. Hawk questioned what time of the day. Ms. Peachlum answered whatever time they want, three or four o'clock in the morning, six, nine, ten o'clock in the morning. She noted it is a very serious issue. Mr. Crissman questioned when you refer to they, who are you talking about. Ms. Peachlum answered that there are two tenants, at first Spring Valley Apartments, they were only referencing one tenant in that unit, but there are actually two, so she asked the gentlemen that lives below her in B-20, if he knew those folks up there. She stated that he said he thought it was a mother and her son. She noted that the mother looks like she is 70 or 80 and the son looks like he is in his 50's. She noted that these people are old enough to know better and why they decided to make this noise within the last month, she does not know. She noted that she hadn't heard that noise the entire time she lived there.

Mr. Crissman questioned if they are new occupants. Ms. Peachlum answered that the guy downstairs said they have been there a while.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if an animal got between the walls like a flying squirrel. Ms. Peachlum answered that it is something they are doing intentionally. Mr. Hawk questioned how long it has been going on. Ms. Peachlum answered that she first reported it to Spring Valley

Apartments on March 5, 2014 and it hasn't stopped. And the police come and they also issue letters to Spring Valley and say that we don't hear anything. She noted that she has been accusing them of false advertising, look you have this on your web site that it is a peaceful and quiet community and you also have it in the brochures. She noted that she is not experiencing that right now. She noted because the police officers can't find the noise, she said it is not a violation of the lease.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the management company will not address the issue with you or do they feel there is insufficient noise for it to be habitable. Ms. Peachlum answered that they are trying to justify their position. She noted if she had an apartment unit and she had a tenant that was complaining she would bolt up the stairs and try to figure out what is going on with my tenant. She noted that they haven't done that, they took three weeks to answer the complaint made on March 5<sup>th</sup>.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if Ms. Peachlum has contacted Mr. DeSouza who owns the apartments. Ms. Peachlum answered that she has been in touch with the regional manager and she ran and got a lawyer. She noted that is ludicrous, she is the one that is complaining; why should she get an attorney.

Mr. Hawk noted that the noise recently started and the noise can be elevated in sound. Ms. Peachlum answered that they can control the noise so that is why she told the police that she feels that the noise is inside the wall and that is why she was asking Mr. Wolfe if he could come back and take measurements because all of these things, she should not hear those things in her apartment. If those buildings were constructed correctly she should not be hearing that, but she went into her bedroom and knocked on one side of the wall and you could hear that clearly on the other side of the wall. She noted that there doesn't sound like there is any insulation or anything.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that those apartments have been there a long time as she lives in a housing development on the other side. Ms. Peachlum noted that she does not know what to say as she is just a tenant trying to pay her rent and live in peace and it is not possible within the last month. She noted that she is at her wits end. She noted that she is present because a police officer asked her to come as there is no noise ordinance in Lower Paxton Township; he said it doesn't have any teeth. He said if there was a noise ordinance he would issue a warning, and a second warning, and then they would be charged and she would have to testify.

Mr. Hawk questioned how long does the noise last. Ms. Peachlum answered for however long they want it to. She noted that sometimes it is a minute, 30 seconds, or five or ten minutes.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if she ever had a confrontation with any one that maybe they are trying to do something to agitate you. Ms. Peachlum answered that she would hope that we have gotten past this in 2014, but she is African American and they are white, so she doesn't know if that is the issue. She noted that she was there for two years with no problems. She noted that someone mentioned that his brother came up and maybe his brother wants the apartment, she has no idea. She noted that she just wants to live there in peace. And there is no noise ordinance in Lower Paxton Township that would help to alleviate the situation.

Mr. Hornung explained that something that will make a noise like that is usually a toilet that when you flush it...Ms. Peachlum said no. Mr. Hornung questioned why do you say no, how do you know. Ms. Peachlum answered that she was there for two years and she can flush her toilet... Mr. Hornung noted that Ms. Peachlum needs to listen to him, nobody knows why it starts, noting the people will live in their homes for 20 years, and all of a sudden it starts tapping in their toilet when they flush the toilet, it starts a vibrating noise and it only lasts a minute or two minutes while the toilet fills. He noted that the trouble is that it goes through the pipe system so it would sound different to you at your level and that could be what is happening. Ms Peachlum said not. Mr. Hornung questioned how she knows that. Ms. Peachlum answered that she hears people flush their toilets all the time, and she knows what he is talking about with the pipes, as she has heard that. She noted that it is not the same noise. She noted that it is like du, du, du, du, and it can go low or high. Mr. Stine noted that it sounds like water hammer to him. Mr. Seeds agreed. Ms Peachlum stated that it is not.

Mr. Hornung noted that we could never make an ordinance to cover such a noise. He asked Mr. Wolfe if that was possible. Mr. Wolfe answered you are talking about noises internal to rental structures; suggesting that Mr. Stine could comment further, but it sounds like a civil matter or more like a tenant landlord issue not a Lower Paxton Township issue. Mr. Stine noted that we cannot regulate internal building noise, noises between properties that are internal to a building.

Ms. Peachlum questioned if there is anyone who would be willing to come over to take measurements regarding the studs to see if they were properly placed at least. She noted that she should not be hearing that stuff in her apartment; that is the bottom line for that. Mr. Stine noted

that the building code is probably different now from what it was then. Ms. Peachlum questioned if there is a building inspector that she should go to. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township would not have the ability to enforce a building code for structures that were 25 or more years old. He noted that the code is designed to regulate new construction. He noted that he did not know where he would have the authority to do that. Ms. Peachlum noted that Spring Valley is probably 40 some years old.

Ms. Peachlum questioned what the Board's suggestion is, noting that she is all lettered out. She noted that she can't continue to live like that. Mr. Seeds noted if they get enough complaints they will start to pay attention or they will lose their tenants. Ms. Peachlum noted that her rent is \$900 a month and there is no way she should be paying that kind of rent and living under that kind of destruction. She noted that it shouldn't be coming from her walls so who regulated the situation 40 years ago.

Mr. Crissman questioned Ms. Peachlum if she asked to be moved to another apartment. Ms. Peachlum answered if she moves she will not stay, but they have not asked that question. She noted that is the same thing the police officer asked and she explained that they waited three weeks to answer the complaint. She noted that the regional manager stated that noise is important to them and she waited a whole week before she answered her initial complaint and management only answered her because she went to Codes for the things that they were not fixing.

Mr. Hawk noted that they should have a responsibility to accommodate your complaint. Ms. Peachlum stated that they are not, so what constitutes a noise ordinance, what sort of noise, outside noise. Mr. Hawk noted that he can't answer that. Ms. Peachlum questioned if Mr. Hawk had a copy of it for her to read. Mr. Seeds noted that the police can enforce a nuisance ordinance, such as a loud vehicle. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township has noise standards in the zoning regulations that have decibel levels attached to them based on the distance from a property line. He noted that the Township does not have anything internal to a structure that he is aware of.

Mr. Crissman noted that the first option is to move; option two would be to change apartments in the complex, and if you have other residents in your building that have the same issue, you should come together and go jointly to the office and say this is not just one person, it is several of us and he would believe that they would want to continue to rent, and if they have people complaining, you are their worst bargaining tool as you would be out telling the

community not to live at this place. He noted that it would hurt their business and this is what he would be doing, rounding up support and going to the office. He noted that you need to do whatever it takes. Ms. Peachlum noted that the only one who has spoken up lives below and adjacent to that apartment. Mr. Crissman noted that by attending this meeting that is televised, people in the community will be hearing that it may not be a place where they would want to live if they are experiencing the same difficulties that Ms. Peachlum is experiencing.

Ms. Peachlum thanked the Board for its time.

Discussion with Appalachia Technologies  
regarding Lower Paxton Township IT Services

Mr. Wolfe explained that he invited Larry Arnold from Appalachia Technologies to speak to the Board to provide an update on his services to the Township since the Fall of 2013 and to discuss where he sees the Township's IT technology moving into the future. He explained that the Township retained Appalachia Technologies in the Fall of 2013 after the retirement of long-time IT Manager, Gary Weisinger. He noted that Appalachia has served as the IT Manager using several staff for both hardware and software needs.

Larry Arnold thanked the Board for providing the opportunity to serve the Township. He noted that Appalachia Technologies is a company located in Mechanicsburg Pennsylvania with 19 engineers who provide consulting services and IT services. He noted that he is not the reseller of any hardware manufacturer products and he is not trying to push any particular products to the Township. He explained that he tries to reutilize the equipment that the Township currently has for any kind of initiative to move forward with technologies.

Mr. Arnold noted from his Mechanicsburg office he provides manning services for the server, fire wall and has staff on site that monitors those devices 24/7, 365 days of the year. He noted if an issue occurs with any equipment on site, his staff will receive an alert and his people will determine what needs to be done, so if it is 3 a.m., his staff is working it, not the Township staff.

Mr. Arnold noted that he provides for an engineer, Brent, to be on-site five days a week, to provide help desk and administrative services. He noted that a senior resource person is also on site three days a week. He noted, in the future this will change, but currently, some of the things that he has provided with the mixture of engineers is taking the current IT system that was in place when his staff started and moving it forward to 2014. He noted that there were many

issues within the IT structure that needed to be changed to move forward. He noted that there were also performance issues and some networking items that were not right. He explained if you have a very congested traffic issue, there will be slow downs and that is what happened with the Township, having issues in the way it was set up. He noted that it is not a direct insult for the previous employee as he was very good at what he did.

Mr. Arnold noted that some of the items that his staff is currently taking care of are in regards to the current desk tops are that Microsoft XP and all support for that system will be ending within a week. He noted that hardware was ordered, getting the best price possible providing a four year lease with the Police Department machines being replaced first to bring this compliance issue up to date. He noted when it comes time to refresh the servers, instead of buying a new server, he would suggest putting it into the virtual world as it saves the cost of hardware, electric and it shows that the Township is going greener using fewer footprints for electric and power.

Mr. Arnold noted that a major issue that his staff is remediating is the IP address for the network. He noted that the IP address which is for each individual segment for the network is currently licensed to the Department of Defense out of Ohio. He noted that he does not know why it was set up like that but he is moving it into the proper IP scheme for a public enterprise network.

Mr. Arnold noted that he has information for the tickets that have been received by his staff. He noted the Township's Department Heads enter help desk tickets for what issues they are having and it routes through his system and comes back to Brent who work five days a week on site to remediate these issues. He noted to date, 148 tickets have been remediated averaging 34 a month, and that does not count the items that Brent does when he is walking through the hall and people come up to him asking him to fix something. He noted that he sent out surveys to gage Appalachia's services and of the seven received, in regards to the timely manner that the service was performed, six respondents answered that it was a great job and one said it was a good job. He noted that all seven stated that the service was very relevant and could be understood.

Mr. Arnold noted that there are three pieces, manning services fees to help those on site and the senior staff fees. He noted that Greg Cover is the senior staff person working with the Township to install networks, install IP addresses, and security. He noted that with service, he

was able to offset the Omega Contract for firewall maintenance saving the Township money in that arena and assisting with the Dallas software migration. He noted that his staff is waiting on additional information in order to move forward for this project.

Mr. Arnold noted that Mr. Covers' three day week assignment will dwindle down to three days a week every two weeks. He noted that staff is plugging up the network issues and moving forward, a senior systems person would set up the virtualization, preparing to retire some of the old hardware. He noted in order to do this the Township will have to purchase some items.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he felt it was important that the IT service provider, who acts as staff filling in those areas previously performed by the IT manager, for the Board to hear from Mr. Arnold first hand. He noted that we will have to meet in the future as there will be a need to discuss the future for what the Township will need to do and how to do it.

Mr. Crissman thanked Mr. Arnold for helping to make the transitions to where we are today. Mr. Arnold thanked the Board for allowing him to serve the Township.

Mr. Hornung questioned how the fees are. Mr. Wolfe answered that the fees that Mr. Arnold is charging is what we have agreed to. He noted that staff has occurred more hours because of multiple things, including the Dallas transition for the financial management software; the network reconfiguration that was not anticipated and outfitting 64 new machines throughout the various Township offices, which has caused more time on Appalachia's part. He noted that we are working in accordance with the agreement but we are using more hours during this transition time.

Mr. Hornung questioned what the fee is. Mr. Wolfe answered that the base fee is \$10,000 a month and augmented services are \$100 an hour. Mr. Hornung questioned what that has been running. Mr. Wolfe answered that it is between \$1,500 and \$1,700 a month. Mr. Arnold noted that once we found what we were dealing we had some major issues, and down the road six months from now, a lot will change and you will not need as much as is needed now. Mr. Hornung noted that Mr. Weisinger tried to piece things together at the lowest price possible and there is a cost to that as well. Mr. Arnold noted that he was very resourceful.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the Board will be considering some of the services that are listed in Mr. Arnold's report that will be beneficial to the Township in the future. Mr. Wolfe answered yes and noted that Mr. Arnold will be back to explain those items. Mrs. Lindsey noted that Brent is doing a good job.

Discussion with Tom Stang of Waste Management regarding  
municipal waste and recycling collection services

Mr. Wolfe noted that two years ago, the Board entered into an agreement with Waste Management for an extension of services for solid waste and recycling collection including leaf waste, providing for an addition five-year contract term through July 1, 2018. He noted that the Board typically meets with Mr. Stang once a year to discuss services.

Mr. Stang explained that he wanted to touch on the services provided by Waste Management, contract terms, rates and what allows for a change in the rate to go up or down and a discussion on industry trends.

Mr. Stang noted that residential units are permitted to put out four containers once a week, in addition to one bulk item per week. He explained that he runs three trucks every day, five days a week, and runs two recycling trucks daily to pick up the recyclables that are unlimited for each customer. He noted the recyclables include: glass, tin, aluminum cans, paper and cardboard to include cereal boxes as well. He noted that yard waste is collected two times a month, April through December, starting this week. He noted that the collection has been heavy already with many people anxious to get outside to do some cleanup. He noted that the Christmas trees are picked up twice in January.

Mr. Stang noted that he had a five-year contract with the Township and in September 2009, the Board approved a five-year extension noting that there would be no increase for the first two years and a 2% increase for the third, fourth and fifth years.

Mr. Stang noted under the terms and conditions of the contract, rates can be increased or decreased based on the cost of disposal at the old Harrisburg Incinerator. He noted the rate increased 3% this year and the increase was passed on to the residents effective April 1, 2014. He noted that Waste Management has no control over the disposal costs and is mandated by Dauphin County to take all trash to the Susquehanna Resource Management Complex, formerly known as Harrisburg Incinerator. He noted that rates can be changed if there is a change in the law regarding disposal or based upon the fuel escalator for fuel costs that can either increase or decrease. He noted since the beginning of the 2008 contract there have been two decreases and three increases. He noted when the contract was implemented, the cost for fuel was \$4.88 a gallon for diesel and now it is \$4.21 a gallon for diesel, but last year at this time it was \$3.96 a gallon. He noted that an increase for the fuel adjuster will occur in July of this year.

Mr. Stang noted for industry trends, more communities are going with wheeled carts and automotive trucks for recycling and trash. He noted that Lower Paxton may want to consider this for the current contract or wait to include this in the bid specs for the new contract. He noted that this was heavy in the western part of the country and is spreading east. Mr. Crissman questioned what costs are associated with that. Mr. Stang answered that the cost of a cart is one thing but we would need to have further discussions for if the hauler would provide the carts or the Township would purchase the carts. He suggested that it would be about \$48 per cart.

Mr. Hornung questioned how it affects the pick up costs. Mr. Stang answered that the productivity goes up with the automotive trucks. He noted when you run the numbers you have to look at the number of carts and the increased productivity. He noted if you look to go with recycling carts, anytime you put large carts in service, the numbers move upward for recycling and trash volumes decrease. He noted when you look at landfill costs at \$80 per ton; any movement from trash to recyclables would be beneficial.

Mr. Stang noted that he entered into a recent contract in the area of Hagerstown Maryland and prior to having carts, it went from five pounds per home to about 16 pounds of recyclables per home. He noted that it was a plus for a community that was not driven to recycle, noting that only 8% of the residents were recycling at the time. He noted that the Township is much further ahead of this. He suggested that the change for the Township would be from ten pounds per home to 15 or 16 pounds per home.

Mrs. Lindsey noted in using the carts, more people would recycle because they can wheel out the carts. Mr. Stang explained when the recycling container is filled; they stop putting recyclables into it and put it in the trash. Mr. Crissman explained that the new carts are much bigger. Mr. Stang noted that a cart is typically 64 gallons and the containers in the Township are 20 gallons. Mr. Wolfe noted that currently, 35 gallon is the maximum container size.

Mr. Hawk noted that he uses a wheeled cart for both types of trash. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Stang is talking about the large containers that you find at the beach with the lids that flip over. He noted that it is double the size of the containers that we permit now. Mr. Seeds noted that at his home in Delaware, the containers are 90 gallons. Mr. Stang noted if you go to a 90 or 96 gallon container, we would probably go to an every-other week collection.

Mr. Stang noted that he is not suggesting a change, but only sharing what is going on in the industry at this time. Mr. Seeds noted that Waste Management would only need one operator

per truck and it would be a big savings. Mr. Stang noted that there is a savings on the labor however, the automotive trucks provide for a significant investment into those trucks than the standard rear-load trucks. He noted that it helps to make things more efficient in the Township and to stabilize pricing.

Mr. Wolfe noted that this is something the Board could consider rolling out in the next contract, noting that there are issues as it would increase productivity and the volume of recyclables; however, you have residents dealing with carts that are twice the size of what they currently have as there may be storage issues on properties and some may not be physically able to move such a large container.

Mr. Crissman noted that it is important to keep abreast of the new trends that may provide a monetary award.

Mr. Seeds verified that the new rates for 2015, 2016, and 2017 are 2%. Mr. Stang answered that was correct.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the senior citizens are aware that they can purchase a per bag system. She noted that it would be a lot cheaper for many of the older folks, especially if they live by themselves. Mr. Stang noted that he did not know if it was on the website... Mr. Wolfe answered that it is on the Township website and it is included in the Township Newsletter before every renewal period.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that there were some problems with the pick up schedule this winter during the bad weather days. She questioned if there was a problem with pick up during the winter storms. Mr. Stang explained that he had some problems with the robocalls made to some people's homes. He explained that the Customer Service Department and Operations Department had some communications issues. He noted that the drivers were running behind schedule, the week that it snowed Monday and Wednesday that he had to park the trucks. He explained that they picked up Monday's collection on Tuesday, and they did not run on Wednesday, so on Thursday, they had Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday to pick up. He explained that some of the drivers finished Tuesday's work, and jumped ahead to start Wednesday's work while some residents were expecting the trash pick up to be delayed another day. He explained that the drivers thought they were doing something good in trying to get caught up.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that sometimes, she gets three robocalls in a row. Mr. Stang noted that it was a communication issue between the callers and drivers and it was an issue as people

did not have their trash out yet. Mrs. Lindsey noted that the robocalls are a great thing but there were some homes where they never go the robocalls and the trash was sitting out all week long as it wouldn't be picked up until the next week. Mr. Stang noted that there was a robocall telling people that they would not have their trash picked up until the following week.

Mr. Hawk noted that Waste Management is very diligent and he appreciates the phone notifications for a change in service. Mr. Stang noted that Waste Management is 83% successful in making phone contact.

Mr. Hornung questioned how much the Township received for reimbursement for recyclables in 2013. Mr. Wolfe answered that he did not have last year's number available but for the 2014 budget, it is projected to be \$140,000. Mr. Hornung noted that it has been as high as \$200,000. Mr. Wolfe explained that it depends on the actual sale price that is offered at the time. He noted that supply and demand rules the price for the recyclable market. Mr. Hornung questioned, if the Township could do an additional \$50,000 increase per year, would it justify switching to the new containers. He noted that recyclables are much lighter so if he was going to switch one system first, or maybe you do both at the same time, he would switch the recyclables first as they are a lot lighter in weight. He noted that it would help to capture more recyclables and more income. Mr. Wolfe suggested that the carts would cost more than \$500,000 for the Township. He noted that Mr. Stang has about 12,000 accounts. Mr. Stang noted that it is more like 13,400 accounts. Mr. Wolfe noted at \$50 a piece, with one for recyclable and one for trash it would be more than \$1,250,000 just for containers.

Mr. Stang noted that he wanted to discuss electronic waste and household hazardous waste collected at resident's homes which is another service Waste Management offers. He noted that residents are not permitted to put out electronic waste as they have to take it to Dauphin County Recycling Center. He noted that some places charge \$20 to \$30 to dispose a TV. He noted that it is a service that he would be able to provide for the residents.. He noted that he can collect pesticides, paint, and other types of chemicals that may have been stored in garages for years that you are looking for a proper way to dispose of it. He noted that people would call and request the service, a kit would be sent out and the materials would be packaged, and within a two week period a box truck would pick it up. Mr. Hornung questioned how much that service would cost. Mr. Stang answered that it averages \$12 a year per home. He noted that you would

be entitled to use it as many times as you want throughout the course of the year. Mr. Hornung questioned if it would include paint. Mr. Stang answered yes.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if many people try to put that stuff out and hoping that you won't see it. Mr. Stang answered it is buried or hidden in the trash, but you have probably seen abandoned TVs sitting at the curb and that is because we are not permitted to pick it up even though the residents put it out as a bulk item. Mr. Hornung noted that he would like to discuss this some time soon. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would put it as a workshop item for discussion.

Continued discussion regarding the debt service schedule  
for the proposed issuance of General Obligation Bonds

Mr. Wolfe noted that he provided a memorandum based upon Option 1 and Option 2 that were previously provided to the Board by John Hewlett and Jay Wenger from Susquehanna Group Advisers. Mr. Hewlett distributed three options to review this evening.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board is looking to borrow \$7 million for Township purposes for a total borrowing of \$32 million for Township and Sanitary Sewer Authority purposes. He noted that the \$7 million for the Township is broken up into two projects: continued stormsewer projects through to 2017 and 2018 and the other is rehabilitation of the existing Public Works Garage with an addition at an estimated project cost of \$4 million.

Mr. Wolfe asked Mr. Hewlett to summarize the information that he distributed to the Board members.

Mr. John Hewlett noted that he has come up with Option 3, a hybrid. He noted that last week the Township adopted a not-to-exceed parameters ordinance authorizing the issuance of 2014 general obligation bonds. He noted that the ordinance defined the projects and established a not-to-exceed- maximum parameters of the principal amount to be issued and maximum interest rates. He noted that the debt service for the bonds can be broken into two pieces, \$25 million allocated to the Authority, with those bonds secured by a subsidy agreement between the Township and the Authority noting that the debt service for the \$25 million would be payable from sewer rentals. He noted that the remaining portion, up to \$7 million for Township projects for stormsewer and renovations to the Public Works facility.

Mr. Hewlett explained that the debt service structure that is being contemplated, for the Authority for the \$25 million is level debt service over a 30 year period. He noted that the Township portion for \$7 million has more flexibility structured into that portion of the ordinance

such as the debt can be structure up to a 20-year maturity, one in three ways. He noted that it can be level debt service, a wrap, or a third option that is a modified wrap service.

Mr. Hewlett noted page two shows the Township's existing debt service. He noted that there is \$9,170,000 in outstanding principal, noting that it lists the annual debt service with the exception of 2014; the annual debt service is about \$840,000 out through 2027.

Mr. Hewlett noted that page four lists level debt service noting that the green sections list the Township's portion, assuming that the full \$7 million in bonds are issued and using the current market interest rates as of a few days ago. He noted that the principal plus interest is structured on a level based over the next 20 years. He noted that it shows a rate of \$500,000 over the next 20 years with a step up from 2014 to 2015 where there is no principal, just interest costs and as principal begins to amortize in 2016, the debt service fully kicks in at \$500,000. He noted when you combine the existing debt service it moves up to roughly \$1.3 million. He noted that he did a mileage study for the debt service noting that the debt service is funded by a mileage increase. He noted, based on level debt service, years 2015 and 2016 will require a mileage increase of .100 mills for the next two years for a total increase of .206 rate.

Mr. Hewlett noted that Option 2 is a Wrap Debt Structure; it delays the repayment of principal until after the existing debt service is paid off. He noted that it would minimize the debt service in the upfront years. He explained that the large principal payments would occur after 2027, when the existing debt is paid off with a debt service in the upfront years of \$282,000 which is mainly interest costs. He noted that the debt service for the old and new issues is overall a level debt service at \$1,100,000. He noted that there is a step up from 2014 to 2015 noting that this has a lower mileage impact of .120 as the aggregate debt service is not as high.

Mr. Hewlett noted that Option 3 is a modified Wrap, a combination of both. He noted that it includes some principal repayment over the years the existing debt is being paid off but the majority of debt is still amortizes beyond 2017. He noted the debt service doubles from under \$400,000 to under \$800,000 in 2028. He noted that mileage impact is between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> option at .164. He noted that the numbers could change based on the total amount of money borrowed and interest rate.

Mr. Hewlett noted that there are benefits as it was done as a parameter ordinance as there is more flexibility with the timing for the bond sale. He noted that the quickest a bond sale could occur would most likely be in three weeks. He noted that a decision would have to be made

prior to pricing the bonds for which option to use; but he wanted to present these three options to the Board based upon the previous discussions. He noted that a summary for all three options can be found on page seven and it shows the total interest paid for all three options, with a range of 3.42% to 3.879% for the interest rates. He noted that the interest rates are very low, and the annual average debt service on the 2014 bonds is \$501,777 versus \$279,548 for the wrap and \$396,031 for the hybrid. He noted that the average annual debt service including the existing debt goes from \$1,348,036 to \$1,125,812 to \$1,242,294.

Mr. Crissman noted that there is a requirement for how long you can extend the payment; Option 2 goes to 2034, is that the limit. Mr. Hewlett answered that it is based on the projects that you are financing. He noted that he could recommend an extension but given the added interest costs for going out further... Mr. Crissman noted that he is not advocating going out, he wanted to make sure we are within the constraints. He noted that he would not advocate going beyond 2034. Mr. Hewlett answered that we are within the constraints for both the useful life requirements as well as what was approved for the ordinance.

Mr. Wolfe noted in the near future, the Board will have to pick an option and determine if it wants to borrow the \$7 million.

Mr. Hewlett noted that the three scenarios show what the Board will be able to do. Mr. Crissman noted that it is very important to him that the debt service remain the same as it goes back to how much the Board would have to raise taxes to offset the debt service. He noted that is why he wants level debt service since he would know what that amount would be and there would be no need to increase taxes in out years to cover increases in the debt service.

Mr. Hawk noted that the discussion with Mr. Robbins later in the agenda will help to determine how much the Board needs to borrow. Mr. Wolfe noted that was correct, but the Board will still have to pick an option for debt service.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that the level debt service has much less interest. Mr. Crissman noted if the Board chooses to be aggressive then it must raise the taxes to a higher level than the other two options. He noted if we go with level debt service we can establish a mileage rate that will cover the Township through the payment period. He noted that the downside is that we will pay more interest but it is no different from buying a house and taking on a mortgage.

Mr. Hawk noted that the debt service is lower under Option Three but you are paying it over a longer period of time.

Mr. Seeds noted that there are probably more options. Mr. Hewlett noted that there would be more options for extensions but he would not recommend them.

Mr. Hawk questioned Mr. Hewlett what his preference would be. Mr. Crissman noted that it would depend on how aggressive the Board wants to be. Mr. Hewlett noted from a rate perspective and the fact that the Board has a low debt burden, if you want to do it as a wrap and pile it on the back, that would be a good thing, but it is a low debt burden, it could be done both ways, a wrap one year and level the next. He noted once you start compounding it on the end, it is tough to stop doing that. He noted that the rates are historically low and even if you choose the wrap, the overall interest rates are below 4%, doing it before any big changes may occur over the next couple of years. He noted that it is weighing the tax impact up front versus the overall interest's costs. Mr. Crissman noted that the first option goes from \$767,000 to 2021 at \$1.4 million with the mileage increasing from .277 to .506. He noted the Wrap debt service holds at .4 for the mileage rate.

Mr. Hewlett noted that part of the increase in 2014 and 2015 is a carryover from the 2013 A bonds from last year. He noted there is a bump of \$140,000 so you have to take into consideration all of the outstanding debt when determining the mileage rate. He noted that there was a bump for the first principal payment for the 2013 A bond issued last year. He noted that is shown in the mileage packet, it is not all attributed to the 2014 new bond issue. He noted that the earliest he would be prepared to go to market is at least three weeks.

Continued review of the Earl Drive  
culvert analysis prepared by HRG

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Fleming would cover this presentation.

Mr. Steve Fleming, HRG, noted that he met with staff, as he wanted to look at three more alternative options that came out of a brainstorming session that was held to ensure that staff was not missing anything and exploring all avenues. He noted that the power point is an update to the previous power point provided.

Mr. Fleming noted that we studied the same area along Earl Drive in the area of Top View and Creek Drives and the backyard areas that flood as related to the tributary that comes down underneath Curvin Drive, along Harman Drive and under Earl Drive to Colonial Road.

Mr. Fleming noted that Option One discussed the possibility of providing a reservoir or detention structure in the drainage basin. He explained that he search the drainage basin and found one possibility. He noted that some of the ideas may seem far fetched but in the engineering world there was some degree of possibility that staff wanted to explore. He noted that it explored the possibility of dewatering the existing marina at Lakeside Marina. He noted that it is a decent size marina, and he did a conception plan where it was dewatered, dug down to provide ten feet of storage capacity. He determined that it was not in the right position within the drainage basin to maximize the efficiency. He noted that we are dealing with 1,500 CFS down at the Earl Drive Culvert; therefore we need to detain a good portion of that impact floodplain at the lower portion and the marina is not located in a position that if effective enough. He explained that red dash lines indicate the area that is tributary to the marina. He explained that you can't get enough run off to get to that point and control it enough to impact the overall drainage which is the area that goes up to Mountain Road and Route 22, and includes portion of the commercial district, the Route 22 corridor, and all the residential in between to Earl Drive. He noted that it is a very large drainage area that we are trying to model. He explained that it was not a viable option on its own, it would be costly, property impact intensive, and not an option the he could pursue.

Mr. Fleming noted that Option Two looked at using the properties that sits along Top View Drive, removing the residential structures, grading the yards out over to Top View Drive, to create a larger flatter floodplain. He noted that he would not be doing anything with the Earl Drive Culvert as it is a very expensive culvert to replace from the structure and utilities that sit on top of it. He thought if he could provide more floodplain area at the culvert, it may help to alleviate the floodplain elevation as it relates to all the properties in that area. He noted, just by removing those properties and grading the area, he was only able to achieve a minor adjustment in the floodplain elevation, less than six inches. He noted, on its own, it is worth keeping in mind, but it won't make any measurable difference.

Mr. Fleming noted that Option Three builds on Option Two. He noted that it looks at replacing the Earl Drive Culvert, removing one additional residential structure that is immediately adjacent to the culvert. He noted for the purposes of the study, he removed the residence on the left as there is more room on the other side to expand the culvert. He noted that he is trying to provide the widest structure he can get in along with doing some re-grading of the

flood plain to combine it with the previous Option Two, removing the three residential structures and grading a larger floodplain in that backyard area to see what could be done in that location. He noted that it would provide a nice impact to the floodplain elevation, but you have to look to see if it is achieving all the objectives that you want to achieve by the project. He noted that the red dash lines are the existing floodplain and the blue dash lines would be the proposed floodplain, so it would provide over two feet of floodplain elevation relief. He noted, due to the way the yards are graded, it does not get the water away from the structures. He noted that depending on the costs and objectives for the project, this may or may not be an alternative that the Board will want to consider. He noted this is the one that he would recommend if you are going to replace the culvert under Earl Drive.

Mr. Fleming showed a cross section of the Powell Property which is where the two streams come together upstream of the Earl Drive culvert. He suggested that the option would be to remove the house and recreate the floodplain.

Mr. Fleming noted that the contributing factors for the actual stream channel when he modeled the channel are: the amount of water flowing through the channel; the width of the bottom and top of the channel; side slopes; and the slope of the channel running from one point to another are the factors that mainly impact the depth of water that is flowing into the channel. He explained that the drawing gives a water surface elevation that is very close to what he got out of his HECRAS Model for modeling the 100-year storm event. He noted that he started to play with different bottom widths and slopes from one point to another. He explained that he included two more cross sections in the power point, as it doubles the channel slope, going from 432.56 to 431.37 by only changing the slope from one point to the next point. He noted the next slide changes it to 429.15 by changing the bottom width and sides.

Mr. Wolfe questioned what the differences were in the slope. Mr. Fleming answered that the existing slope is less than 2% and he went to under 4%. He noted that the only parameter that he did not change for the HECRAS Analysis, since he has two fixed points, was the area of Curvin Drive and all those elevations in the backyards and ultimately the Earl Drive culvert. He noted that the one parameter that he can't change would have the most impact. He noted that it is important to know all the different parameters that impact the depth of water flowing through that area and that he looked at everything that he could impact and the one factor that he can't.

Mr. Fleming noted that this was only a study and no project has been designed yet. He noted, at this time, he is looking for direction to move to the next stage if the Board chooses to do so. He noted that he has identified all of the potential costs associated with the project and it is a matter of setting the scope for the design to look at some of the private property areas for which culvert should be replaced.

Mr. Hornung questioned for Options Two and Three, there would be a requirement to acquire residences. Mr. Fleming answered yes, noting that the previous study did not require looking at doing that or acquiring easements for grading. He noted that those same easements would be required for the properties. He explained that he stepped outside the easement approach and looked to remove structures to make sure we were not missing some key element in the drainage area. Mr. Hornung questioned if Mr. Fleming tried to do everything he could to avoid taking any property to move to the next step of the project. He explained that he wanted the Board to understand the impact of every decision available.

Mr. Seeds noted that we have had many studies over the past number of years but the last one noted that the culvert pipe is deteriorating, the bottom part, and we discussed changing it. Mr. Fleming explained that he looked at the culvert pipe with Lane Enterprises, a pipe manufacturer, and they found one section that has a bulge, and a little bit of corrosion, but nothing that has gone through the metal at any critical area. He noted that it was determined that Lane can remove one or two of the bottom plates and install a new bottom plate by burning off the bolts with a welder or unbolting them and installing new bottom plates.

Mr. Seeds noted that we also discussed cleaning up or widening the channel for an area upstream. He noted that this is not the option that is under consideration as you have looked at different options. Mr. Fleming answered that he is still taking into account the work upstream in the model as it is an important component in the project. He noted that the channel as it exists today is narrow and graded as residential rear yards, not necessarily with channel hydraulics in mind for a 100-year storm event. He noted in order to improve the efficiency you will have to do grading upstream; however the culvert under Earl Drive does have a big impact on the immediate hydraulic function. He noted that one foot of removal could cost \$500,000 to \$1 million to replace the culvert under Earl Drive versus doing a maintenance project on the order of \$200,000. Mr. Seeds noted that would include replacing part of the pipe and widening the

channel but would only remove about one foot of water in a hundred year storm. Mr. Fleming noting that it would be a hybrid approach to all the different scenarios.

Mr. Seeds questioned, in order to put in a box culvert, one property would have to be taken. Mr. Fleming answered yes as you can not put a wider structure in as the properties are built out to the culvert as it exists today.

Mr. Hornung questioned what direction you are looking for from the Board. Mr. Fleming answered if the Board wishes he will move forward with one design approach over another or let the project sit while the Board considers it.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if it includes replacing the pipe upstream. Mr. Fleming noted that Top View is a project that is designed but he has to submit the permit and depending on the scope of this project, it might be included into a joint permit versus doing a separate permit. Mrs. Lindsey questioned if any of the options include it. Mr. Fleming answered yes; Top View will be replaced and it is ready to be permitted at this point.

Mr. Seeds questioned if it would be a box culvert. Mr. Fleming answered that it would be an arch.

Mr. Fleming noted that the previous presentation that he made considered leaving the Earl Drive culvert in place and doing grading in the rear yards, no taking of any properties, and replacing the Creek Drive culvert. He noted that the alternatives that he brought to the meeting tonight look at impacting various residential properties as part of the project. He noted if you are not willing to replace the Earl Drive culvert you won't need to take the property on each side and you won't get a very large impact by taking the other three residential structures other than removing them from properties that are covered by the floodplain. He noted that Options Two and Three are basically the same thing, one replaces the Earl Drive culvert and one did not. He noted that the first option included the work on the marina. Mr. Seeds noted that Mr. Fleming stated that it would not help much.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if we don't replace the box culvert at Earl Drive will we continue to have the water issues at Top View that they are having today. Mr. Fleming answered that the properties that are impacted in the rear yards still have the potential for basement flooding. He noted that he can remediate that for smaller storms less than 100 years, they won't have such a high frequency of property damage. He noted that he would recommend doing the

maintenance at the Earl Drive culvert and grading in the rear yards but not taking of any residential properties, and include the replacement of the Creek Drive culvert.

Mr. Robbins stated that whatever options the Board selects, you will know what the outcome would be. He noted that the Board needs to know what the costs are for the options so when it gets to the point where we have a storm we have an idea of what to expect.

Mr. Hawk questioned if any cost analysis has been done yet. Mr. Fleming answered that he has done various cost estimates associated with the different structures but the hard thing to access is the cost to acquire the private property. He noted that he has not formalized anything beyond the estimates that were previously presented.

Mr. Seeds questioned what would be the results for the property owners. Mr. Fleming answered that it would lower the flood level by a little less than a foot.

Mr. Robbins noted that this is not an easy decision, noting that we don't design culverts for 100 year storms. He explained whatever decision the Board makes he wants to make sure it knows where it is taking it.

Mr. Hawk questioned if there is a significant difference between lowering a foot and moving faster. Mr. Fleming answered yes noting that he gave the example, if we could double the channel slope from Curvin Drive through the Earl Drive culvert, we could pass a lot more water through it and the water depth during the storm event would be lower because the water was moving much faster. Mr. Robbins noted that we can't do that very effectively with the current culvert since it is so narrow. Mr. Hawk noted that you have to widen both the channel and the culvert. Mr. Fleming answered yes.

Mr. Seeds questioned when the existing Earl Drive culvert would have to be replaced. Mr. Fleming answered, if you replace the bottom pieces with a good gauge metal, by all indications the arch pipe is in very good shape so if you replace the damaged parts which is the bottom....Mr. Seeds noted that we have to do something at some point. Mr. Fleming noted that it would be relative to the number of severe storms the Township experiences as they take their toll on the structure. He suggested that you could probably get another ten years out of the pipe with out doing anything, but you could get another 30 to 40 years out of it by doing the maintenance as it would be returning it to a like-new condition. He noted that the culvert serves a critical role as it is essentially a bridge that carries Earl Drive, a cut-through road that provides many residents with access to Colonial Road as well as carrying the utilities to that area, such as the

water line and gas line. He noted that a catastrophic failure would not only lose the culvert pipe and potential flooding, but you would lose the transportation connection as well as the utility connections.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that what initiated this was the residents who got water in their basements so what can we do to prevent that from happening.

Mr. Crissman noted that this will not solve the problem.

Mr. Gerald Hopple noted that he is one of those residents who had water in his basement. He explained that he added a five foot wall around the back of his home and the water pushed his basement doors open. He noted that you can't predict those types of storms.

Mr. Hopple questioned for the north side of Earl Drive, is there any plans to clean the trees along the embankment that could collapse into the culvert. Mr. Robbins answered to his knowledge he had no plans to go into the area from a hydraulic standpoint. Mr. Hopple noted, during the summer that area grows up with thick brush and it slows the flow of the water going down through the area, and in the winter it all dies out but in the spring you can see a water path in that area. Mr. Fleming noted once you get to the north side, that area spreads out flat and low, the floodplain elevation drops once it gets out of the culvert. He noted that there was some talk about that area where the trees are located. Mr. Hopple noted that it would be the Township's call to do something about that. He noted that it needs to be looked at before they fall into the stream channel. He noted that the roots are sticking out of the embankment and someone needs to look at it. He explained that he would like to have something done to prevent the water from backing up into the homes.

Mr. Hornung questioned what is the price to replace the culvert only, without acquisitions. Mr. Fleming answered that he did not have that figure with him but suggested that a box culvert structure would be \$750,000 taking into road restoration and temporary utilities. He noted that the total cost made him look at other options.

Mr. Hornung noted that there is no other option that would work short of replacing the culvert. Mr. Fleming noted that even with replacing the culvert, you will only lower the 100-year flood elevation by two feet and that is the option that would take all four properties, replacing the culvert under Earl Drive and culvert under Creek Drive and it still doesn't impact the depth of flow along Harman Drive. He noted that there are properties with exposed basements where the basement elevation is literally two or three feet off of the streambed. He noted that most of the

water that flows down through there, based on his channel example, are only several feet deep. He noted that those properties will be impacted by the amount of water that flows down through there.

Mr. Hornung noted that none of the options... Mr. Fleming answered that there is no real way to address that condition based on the structures sitting in proximity to the streambed. Mr. Robbins noted whichever decision the Board makes, it needs to know what the end result will be. He explained that the Board could spend \$400,000 to lower the flood elevation by half a foot.

Mr. Fleming noted, as a result of the 2011 storms, FEMA made money available to acquire residential structures that were built within the floodplain. He noted that the thought process is to remove the hazard instead of trying to reduce the floodplain elevation. He noted that FEMA doesn't believe that a structure should have been built in those situations in the first place. He noted that they are providing money now, federal funds for municipalities and other organizations, to acquire the properties, demolish them, and restrict the property use in the future. He noted that this would be another option that could be explored but he was unsure of the availability of those funds.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned with all the scenarios mentioned, if there is anything that will eliminate the water from coming up closer to the homes. Mr. Fleming answered that a levy would be the only other thing that you could install that would create a wall for the water to rush against but the tighter you restrict the channel, the higher the water level would be. He noted that the cost of constructing a structure like that with the homes being so close to the stream would be a feasibility issue.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he was not looking for a decision tonight as it will require additional discussion.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if it was on road tour. Mr. Wolfe answered yes.

Mr. Hornung questioned what we would discuss if there are not good options available to the Board. He noted once you get into spending millions of dollars then you should look at getting FEMA funds to acquire the properties and razing them and be done with it. Mr. Wolfe noted that maintenance of the Earl Drive culvert still needs to occur and channel maintenance. Mr. Fleming noted that the Creek Drive culvert needs to be replaced. Mr. Seeds noted that it is in the plans to do it. Mr. Fleming noted that it is a decision the Board needs to make but it should

move forward with the maintenance of the Earl Drive culvert and the replacement of the Creek Drive culvert.

Mr. Hornung noted that reducing the water by two feet still would not solve Mr. Hopple's problem. Mr. Hopple noted that it rose 5.5 feet over his wall to impact his house during the 2011 storm. Mr. Fleming noted that it would only improve two of the five foot problem that Mr. Hopple has.

Status report regarding ongoing efforts  
to apply clean fill to the Wolfersberger Tract

Mr. Wolfe noted that staff has been working to come up with a solution to fill the front 50 acres of the Wolfersberger Tract that abuts Wenrich Street. He noted that it is being done in conjunction with a Wolfersberger Tract feasibility study for park development and in conjunction with the sanitary sewer ongoing projects that need disposal sites for clean fill. He noted that HRG has developed a fill plan for the Wolfersberger Tract front 50 acres that will comply with the rough elevations of the park development plan and will allow the disposal of sanitary sewer clean fill from ongoing projects primarily in the Beaver Creek area. He noted to get the site ready for the acceptance of clean fill there are several activities that need to be undertaken which will have to be done by competitive bid and he is asking HRG to prepare the bid documents and administer the process for the Township.

Mr. Fleming noted that the plan was presented during a previous workshop session for the matter in which the fill will be placed on site. He noted that he has undertaken delineation services and work through the NPDES Permitting with the Conservation District and the project is at the point where it needs to engage a contractor to get the site prepared to accept the fill and work with a separate contractor to manage the site and make sure the fill is placed properly in accordance with the plans in a manner which yields the highest returns for the sewer authority and ultimately the Township.

Mr. Fleming noted that they would place the fill on the south side of the park, dividing the 50 acres into two halves, so the southern quarter would be the focus immediately and the northern quarter would be the secondary focus. He noted that the contract would enable a contractor to clear and grub the site, install the perimeter controls, create necessary construction entrances, as well as strip and stockpile the topsoil for the southern border to enable the contractors to haul and dump their fill in that area. He noted that a second contractor would push

and compact the soil once it is placed. He explained that the reason he is taking a quarter of the land approach, focusing on the south first and the north second is because the south is close to existing grades and the project will be able to deliver a usable area of this range quicker. He noted that once it is done, they will move the haul and dump site to the northern quarter area, while the southern site is prepared to be developed as park space.

Mr. Fleming noted that the Conservation District will also be able to keep areas of the site stabilized quicker and longer.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Fleming has provided a proposal for the engineering work to get to this point at a cost of \$18,000. Mr. Fleming noted that the \$18,000 covers putting the design and permitted drawings into a construction contract, advertise and bid the process as well as review the construction payment applications and other administrative items. He noted that it does not include construction observation services.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Fleming had a contract in place now. Mr. Wolfe explained that it was for the planning and permitting of the project. Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Fleming is proposing to do half of the southern portion of the park like 25 acres. Mr. Fleming answered that the full site was presented at the previous meeting, to take those drawings, put them into a construction contract, put it out for bid, and over see the administrative process of that contract, to include issuing the award, pre-construction meeting, and reviewing payment applications.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the E&S Plan is completed. Mr. Fleming answered yes, noting that he is awaiting approval of the general permit application for the wetland crossings.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the first fill could be applied to the area in the fall. Mr. Fleming answered yes, noting that he would like to have the construction contract out on the street in the next couple of weeks in order to have a contractor mobilized to the site sometime this summer as the Sewer Authority wants to demonstrate to the bidders that the site will be ready to accept fill. Mr. Wolfe explained that this bid has to be done as soon as possible to work in conjunction with projects that will be bid by the Sewer Authority. He noted that part of the bid process will be a requirement to put the fill at this site. He noted that he expects to receive more favorable bids as they will have a close and convenient place to use and they won't have to manage their own site. He noted that the Township will have the management responsibilities. He explained, with the lower bid prices, he expects the Sewer Authority to provide the Township with a credit for the

Board to review, with the Sewer Authority paying the costs to put this into place up to the cost of the credit that they will receive on an estimated basis from contractors.

Mr. Seeds questioned if we would allow anyone else to use this site. Mr. Wolfe noted that given the park development plan and the amount of fill that we will have from the sanitary sewer basins, the potential to fill the site within three years from sanitary sewer work and Township work, the answer is yes.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the soils would be compacted as it is filled. Mr. Fleming answered that this contract will facilitate that so the sewer contractors will direct their dump trucks to dump at Wolfersberger Tract in piles in an organized fashion and there will be an arrangement with the site contractor who will oversee the site and perimeter controls and at certain points he will bulldoze the material off into certain thicknesses and compact it.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Township provides a lot of work to HRG and we don't go out for competitive prices for that work and sometimes when he sees a price he wonders if we could do better if we started to get bids, so he would like Mr. Fleming to sharpen his pencil so he would not have to go out and look around. He noted, in the past, we have done not-to-exceed, time and materials, and he asked Mr. Fleming to prepare that for the next time. Mr. Fleming noted that he was in a hurry and stated that he knows that is how the Board likes to see the contracts and he has no problem with that as it is written for time and materials, noting that he does not want to charge for more time than needed.

#### Review of Winfield Street stormsewer replacement alternatives

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Winfield Street area drainage basin has been subject to flooding as well and has very undersized and failing stormsewer systems. He noted that staff has analyzed the area in the past and Mr. Fleming has done a more detailed analysis and has three alternatives for cost estimates for consideration this weekend.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the Board has already made a selection for this. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Board has not done that.

Mr. Fleming noted that he provided the results of the study and now it has moved to a design phase. He noted in coordination with Mr. Robbins and Public Works Department, they applied for a Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Disaster Relief Grant for this project, applying for \$1.4 million. He noted that the project was awarded so he will be moving into a phase of the project that will be largely funded through the grant program. He noted that

he has gone through an evaluation with Dauphin County who is administering the grant program to make sure that there was enough money awarded to do the construction. He noted that part of the grant program is to do an environmental review with part of that considering other design alternatives. He noted, before he went into final design, he took another look at some of the alternatives that he identified in the study and put preliminary designs together for three different scenarios. He noted the reason that he is present this evening is the design storm that he typically designs for is a 10-year storm event. He noted that it includes all the conveyance structures except for critical conveyance structures which this could be consider one. He noted that the design for a 10-year storm frequency; however, the alternatives determined that we can't feasibly get a stormsewer project designed and constructed that will facilitate the 10-year storm event. He noted that the volume of stormwater in the same drainage basin that he was discussing earlier, handling part of the shopping center district and as far as the Friendship Center, and parts of Route 22 all flow down through this area. He noted that the existing system uses a 36 inch pipe.

Mr. Fleming noted that Alternative One is to install three 48 inch culverts side-by-side through the length of most of the drainage basin but it would not provide the design for the 10-years storm. He noted that an alternative design looked at extending a pipe up Devonshire Road to try to cut off some of the drainage before it gets to Winfield Street but this did not achieve the 10-year storm plan, having a higher construction cost. He noted that the third alternative which is what he would like to recommend this evening is to install one pipe through the drainage basin, as large of a pipe through the drainage basin that we physically could. He noted that this was a capacity approach to provide a comfort level that he is doing the best that he could with it and what it ultimately is. He suggested a 60-inch culvert at the bottom through most of the drainage way, a swash pipe that is 33 inches high by 49 inches wide, an aluminum metal pipe that would give you less than one of your design storm events, but with an average capacity of 84%. He noted that the 84% provides the ability to covey 140 CFS of stormwater but the proposed system would give you 211 CFS. He noted that it is a significant increase in capacity over what you have today noting that there were some minor impacts to the private property as they have a frequent road flooding condition that exists that he is trying to minimize, and he thinks the 84% increase will minimize the duration of those events and likely remove any private structure impact.

Mr. Hornung questioned where this water goes after it leaves this area. Mr. Fleming answered that it goes under Colonial Road and over to Susquehanna Township.

Mr. Fleming noted that the other benefit of alternative three is that the cost of the project is less than originally estimated.

Mr. Hornung questioned when the Board has to make a determination for which alternative to go with. Mr. Fleming answered that it needs to be made soon since the grant process is starting and they will want to move the projects into final design and construction.

Mr. Wolfe questioned what the municipal share on the grant is. Mr. Fleming answered that he did not know if there were any shares. He suggested that there may be some engineering depending on how the grant program is worked out. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is to the Board's advantage to utilize the CDBG Disaster Recovery funds. Mr. Fleming noted that the worst case scenario would be to know that the grant was awarded as the Township shouldn't have any costs associated with this project. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board needs to move forward as fast as possible.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if Mr. Fleming was recommending alternative three. Mr. Fleming answered yes as there is enough money in the grant award to cover it as it is almost a million dollars.

Mr. Crissman noted that he has no problem with moving forward. Mrs. Lindsey noted that we should make a decision tonight for this. Mr. Crissman noted that it should be put on the agenda. Mr. Wolfe questioned what kind of action Mr. Fleming needs. Mr. Fleming noted that he would need a formal recommendation to move forward with Alternative Three and final design under the grant program. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would put a resolution on for the April 15<sup>th</sup> meeting.

#### Review of the Public Works Expansion Feasibility Study

Mr. Wolfe noted the Board authorized staff to expend funds to do a conceptual analysis of the Public Works Building to determine what would be appropriate for adding space to the facility, determination of a general amount of space that would be necessary to meet existing and future needs, generalized location of where the space would be added, and a schematic budget estimate for the space. He noted when the work was done, it also came at a time when the Township hit tight financial times and as a result the study was set aside; however, the budget constraints of 2008 through 2011 have improved and the Board is talking about expanding the

Public Works Building. He suggested that it was appropriate to review the document to get some ideas in regard to size and the amount to be spent for the Public Works needs to include future needs.

Mr. Robbins provided in the Board packets a copy of the HRG Study that was previously done. He noted that one of the main focuses for the expansion is to make sure the Township has a facility to clean the vehicles. He noted that he had some very good equipment to maintain the roads and do stormwater projects but it is very important to keep the vehicles clean as part of the NPDES Permit and MS4 program under control item number six which is called pollution and prevention. He noted that it is good housekeeping to have a facility where we can clean vehicles as it is not good to wash trucks outside where the water can run anywhere. He explained that is not a good practice by today's standards.

Mr. Robbins noted when the Highway Department moved from the Lockwillow Street location in 1988 to the current building, there were 149 miles of street in the Township and 24 traffic signals with 16 staff and two administrative employees. He noted currently, there are 202 miles of road, with 39 traffic signals and a staff of 32. He noted that the Township is growing and that is why he is talking about expanding the building.

Mr. Robbins noted that there are site constraints with the existing site as to the north there are existing ball fields, to the south is the existing salt dome and cell tower, and to the west there is a steep ravine that borders a residential neighborhood. He noted that it would be very expensive to expand to the west. He noted that the Sewer Garage is located to the east.

Mr. Robbins noted that a garage is classified as a Moderate hazard Storage Group S-1 and the office personnel facilities are classified as Business Group B. He noted that it is a commercial area that is greater than 5,000 square feet and it houses commercial vehicles therefore if the building would be expanded it must have an automatic sprinkler system. He noted for the options that don't touch the existing building a sprinkler system is not required.

Mr. Robbins noted that there was a total of eight options that were evaluated but he did not price options five through eight. He noted that all those options involved expansion to the south or west which drove the costs much higher.

Mr. Robbins noted that staff examined options one through four in detail to include the advantages and disadvantages.

Mr. Robbins noted that option one includes an 8,000 square foot garage attached to the south side of the existing building with an additional 1,450 square foot personnel facilities and office space of 1,428 square feet to the north side of the building. He noted a free standing garage of 2,800 square feet and a truck wash of 2,400 square feet would be constructed on the north side of the site. He explained that the brine, barricade, cone, and tire storage would be a wood pole building 2,100 square feet located next to the existing salt building. He noted that it would require the building to be sprinkled. He noted that the advantages would be that it is utilizing all the available space around the existing building without encroaching on the ball field. He explained that the disadvantage is that it meets current needs but does not allow space for expansion, the existing transformer would have to be relocated and there would be circulation issues for the flow of traffic. He noted that the cost estimate for Option one is \$3,937,615.

Mr. Robbins noted that Option Two includes 16,200 square foot garage and 4,290 square feet of office and personnel space and it would be constructed to the north of the existing building. He noted that the truck wash would be located on the north side of the building and the wood pole storage building would be located in the same place. He noted that it would not require the old part to be sprinkled and would require the elimination of one ball field. He noted that it would provide for ample space for existing and future needs, cost per square foot to build a separate building is less than adding on the existing building, the existing garage would not need to be sprinkled, and it eliminates the removal of six inches of soil to make the building floors the same elevation. He noted that the disadvantages are that one ball field would have to be removed and the building is a separate building from the existing building and the cost is \$4,823,137. He explained that he is quoting 2011 numbers.

Mr. Robbins noted that Option Three has the same square footage for the garage space with 4,460 square feet of office space. He noted that the truck wash would be the same and so would the wooden storage building. He noted that this option would require the buildings to be sprinkled noting that the advantage is that the buildings are connected, and there would be ample room for future need and it eliminates the removal of six feet of soil to make the floors the same elevation. He noted that the disadvantages would be that one of the baseball fields would be eliminated and the floor elevation between the office and personnel facilities would require a ramp or elevator. He noted that the price for this would be \$5,033,985.

Mr. Robbins noted that Option Four has 16,200 square feet with 3,450 square feet for personnel and office space. He noted that the office space is a little smaller but it would also require that the existing garage be sprinkled since it would be connected to it. He noted that it would be on the same floor elevation and the truck wash would be located in the same area as well as the wooded pole storage building. He noted that there would be ample garage space for now and into the future. He noted that the disadvantage is that one baseball field would have to be eliminated and it would require the removal of six feet of soil to elevate the floor to the same level as the existing garage. He noted that the total cost estimate for this option is \$4,905,021.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that under the first option, Mr. Robbins included the improvement to the personnel facilities, but she questioned which option has all that he is looking for or needs to have. Mr. Robbins answered that each option has what he needs, with the exception of some office space. He noted that the building requirements are pretty much the same but what makes it different is how they are situated on the site. Mrs. Lindsey noted that vehicle space is an important issue for the way they are squeeze into the garage. He explained that he needs to look at his department to see where he will be in the future for staff and equipment.

Mr. Seeds noted that the total square footage is about 25,000 square feet. Mr. Robbins answered that is correct. Mr. Seeds noted that he visited the site today and Mr. Robbins showed him around and stated that he didn't want to lose a ball field. He noted that that Teener field would have to be relocated up to George Park as there is already a back stop in the park. He stopped to look at the back stop at George Park and it is a nice new back stop. He noted that there were soccer nets all over the place as well so he would like to hear from Mr. Luetchford about that at some point in time. He noted that we would have to look at those costs and should it be done simultaneously so we don't lose the use of a field. Mr. Luetchford noted that he and Mr. Robbins discussed this noting that the Township owns some field space behind the Public Works Building, and George Park has the back stop that the soccer association is using. He noted that the Paxtonia Athletic Association was promised a Teener field at that location, noting that they are also in discussion with the School District to use a Teener field. He noted if they get a positive reply he would be okay with abandoning the field at George Park as CASA is very interested in having soccer fields at that location instead of baseball.

Mr. Luetchford explained that there is a Babe Ruth Field and a medium size field that are in the impacted area for this project. He noted that it is the only Babe Ruth Intermediate field in

the area and it is used by Linglestown Baseball, Paxton Baseball and the Harrisburg Christian School. He noted that he did not know if he could find the space at George Park but is in discussion with the Colonial Park Baseball Association for Mateer Field as they no longer use it.

Mr. Seeds noted that we installed a back stop at George Park and it was intended to be a ball field. Mr. Luetchford agreed that was the understanding at the time it was installed. Mr. Seeds questioned if it was put in from the very beginning. Mr. Luetchford answered that it was put in five or six years ago. Mr. Seeds suggested that Mateer field may not be large enough for what you want, and it would concern him if we lose a field.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that Mr. Seeds is concerned about a baseball field but we have to remember that the resident's assets are located at this site, the roof is leaking, the equipment is pushed together, and we need to take care of what is out at the Public Works. She stated that it is obviously that it hasn't been taken care of for a long time.

Mr. Crissman noted Option Four connects the buildings, and he suggested that it would be a major advantage for staff, noting that option three and four are the consideration but he questioned Mr. Robbins, if Option 3 needs an elevator or ramp and is Option 4 low, he questioned, not knowing what the costs are to keep it all on one level, as opposed to putting in the elevator or ramp with maintenance costs for an elevator. Mr. Wolfe noted that they are schematic designs set forth to provide a planning number. He noted if the Board determines that it wants to do this, it will need to retain an architect, and do a more in depth analysis. Mr. Crissman noted that there would be more changes as a result of that.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he did not want the Board to go into a borrowing scenario without having some idea of what improvements Mr. Robbins is asking for the Public Works. Mr. Crissman noted that the bottom line is that it could cost \$5 million.

Mr. Hornung suggested that it would be more than \$5 million if you include the relocation of the ball fields and sprinkler system. He suggested that it would probably be closer to \$5.5 million. He noted that you don't have the water capacity at that building to sprinkle it so that means you will have to pump water from some place. Mr. Robbins answered that he believed that he has enough surfaced area as he would have to go behind the water meter that was installed for the Sewer Garage but there is water on the site and it is sufficient. Mr. Robbins suggested that the sprinkler numbers were built into the costs under building conditions and modifications.

Mr. Robbins noted that there is close to \$500,000 of contingencies built into these numbers but we have to update the number to make sure they are current. He noted when they started the process he never went to visit InterClean, the company that has the car washing facility. He noted that it is very expensive. He explained that he is not sure he will go with that option but will have to decide what options to pursue as it may help to lower the costs a little bit. He noted that he needs a washing facility to keep the trucks cleaned inside so people are not standing outside in the winter washing vehicles.

Mr. Hornung noted that Mr. Robbins went from 8,000 to 16,000 square feet but he questioned what is wrong with 12,000 square feet. Mr. Robbins answered that it does not provide for enough space into the future. He noted that it would work but he would get to where we are now a little sooner. He noted when you consider where the Department is going to be going... Mr. Hornung questioned where will that be. Mr. Robbins answered that we need to talk about that as we go through the planning process as he would like to have an Operations Person and it would require hiring people, and he suggested that we need to sit down and figure that out.

Mr. Hornung noted that we currently have 25,000 square feet and if we add another 8,000 square feet, it is a 28% expansion that would be adequate for where we are right now but if we had another 8,000 square foot he needs to know why. He noted that we will have to have those discussions before we jump to 16,000 square feet. He noted that he does not see the Township adding a lot of new roads noting that the TND will be a new development. He noted that we need to discuss the need for more trucks. Mr. Wolfe noted that we will provide additional information for the Board as those are fair questions raised by Mr. Hornung. He explained, what we wanted to do this evening was to provide a schematic overview of what this could be but the Board needs to let staff know what it can do. He noted that this Board has never provided a blank check for staff to go ahead and spend funds and if the Board borrows the funds staff needs to know what the parameters are. He noted that it will be a give and take between what staff believes it needs versus what the Board is going to spend.

Mr. Hornung noted that he wants to know what Mr. Robbins plans to do with the rest of the space and he agrees that we need more space and we have to be environmentally conscience to provide an adequate truck washing facility. He noted that his struggle is that he wants to know what the needs are and then build accordingly.

Mrs. Lindsey suggested that the Board members should visit the location to see what is needed. Mr. Wolfe noted that it could be done after the breakfast at Public Works.

Mr. Hawk noted for Options Two, Three and Four, the price is not very different, but he questioned if there is an advantage to having the buildings connected or separate. Mr. Robbins noted from his point of view he would like to have the additions connected as he frequently leaves his office to go out to speak to the mechanics and he would like to be as close as he can. Mr. Hawk noted that Option One does not meet the future garage needs, so he ruled that out noting that Option Two would be a separate building, and Option Three requires an elevator but he questioned how important that is. Mr. Robbins answered that he looks at the separation from the two elevations from 472 to 478 as a physical separation of the building. He noted although they are connected, you would have to go 100 feet to get where you want to be. Mr. Hawk noted that it helps him to zero on certain options. Mr. Wolfe noted that these are only schematics and will change dramatically when going to design. He noted that it shows if we need this much space, where we could possibly locate it and how much would it cost, but no fine engineering has been done at this point.

Mr. Hawk noted an addition of 16,200 square feet would only be Options 2, 3, and 4. Mr. Robbins noted that he wanted to be around 16,000 square feet and he may be able to identify why he chose that figure but the reason why it was not greater was because of the site constraints. He noted that you can't go in either direction along the back side of the building as it would reduce the feasibility of how it functions and operates. Mr. Hawk noted if you go with a separate building with the existing building as it is now, you can modify the existing lunch room and offices. Mr. Robbins noted that it would be part of the overall plan.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the basic question is what the Board's financial commitment will be out of the \$7 million. Mr. Wolfe noted that he is not even asking that at this point, rather, when the Board goes to borrow that it is willing to borrow the \$7 million knowing that a large portion of that will go for this project. Mr. Crissman noted of those funds, this project would use \$4 to \$5 million of it. Mr. Wolfe noted that he wanted to make sure the Board had that discussion before the day of actually issuing the bond. Mr. Crissman suggested that this is not a want but a need.

Status report on the collection of delinquent sanitary sewer accounts

Mr. Wolfe noted that he wanted to provide a brief summary of where we stand with the collection of the sanitary sewer accounts for several reasons. He noted over the last several months, the Board implemented a new program to collect overdue accounts for the Lower Paxton Township Authority through the services provided by Modern Recovery. He noted that it is a for-profit collection agency that bills based upon a percentage of dollars collected as opposed to a fee schedule. He noted that it was a different approach to delinquent accounts as previously we had a fee schedule rendered by that collector.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the delinquencies for sanitary sewer total roughly \$665,537 about 4% of the accounts, and in dollar terms it is about 5% of the budget. He noted that this amount has grown substantially since the economic recession in 2007; what was roughly \$450,000 to \$500,000 in delinquencies has now grown to \$650,000. He noted that accounts are turned over to Modern Recovery in batches after they are at least 270 days delinquent.

Mr. Wolfe noted Mr. Weaver's memorandum explained that the Authority bills almost 16,000 sanitary sewer accounts and expect revenues of \$12.5 million. He noted that Mr. Weaver attached a summary of the accounts that have been placed with Modern Recovery, and since November of 2012 the Authority has placed 303 accounts in collection. He noted that the total dollar amount is \$743,264.93 and they have collected \$462,303.58; with \$300,000 returned to the Authority, reducing the delinquent accounts total significantly. He noted that the current amount that is outstanding is \$650,000. He noted that it is a changing number as delinquencies are paid or added. He noted that of the amount given to Modern Recovery, they have collected almost 40% which is \$208,000.

Mr. Seeds noted that there have been articles in the newspaper that discussed other Townships that are much smaller than we are and they have higher delinquencies. He suggested that we are doing quite well considering. Mr. Wolfe noted that the rate of delinquencies have increased over the past few years; before the recession the Township never had more than one or two abandoned properties or code issue properties in any one year. He noted that we now have a list of well over 100 in length. He noted that those properties don't have people paying sanitary sewer bills as well and he surmised that it has increased based upon the economic conditions.

Mr. Hawk noted that he was amazed at the number of water shutoffs. He questioned if it was for abandoned properties. Mr. Wolfe explained that the Township has the ability to shut off

water for non-payment of sanitary sewer. He noted that it is a far easier process for the Township than going to a sheriff's sale. He noted that the water company will also shut off water service for non-payment as well. He explained when the water is shut off the home becomes uninhabitable. He noted that you can't live in a house in the Township if you don't have potable water. He noted that we also have the Codes Department start the process of eviction.

Mr. Hornung noted that he has had people come to him to complain about their water being shut off and he has learned a lesson to stay out of those discussions. He warned his fellow Board members if anyone approached them to request relief, the answer is no as they must work it out with the collection agency. He noted that he has learned that their stories don't hold up, noting that he has talked to people who have not paid their bills for five or six years for one reason or another.

Mr. Hawk noted that he has received calls from people who have the water company coming to shut off their water and he has told them to pay their bill.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the sanitary sewer customers have many opportunities to pay their bills before any action is taken by the Township or Modern Recovery.

#### Status report on the Friendship Center Priority projects (user survey)

Mr. Luetchford noted that there have been many discussions over the past few months about the priority project for the Friendship Center. He noted that it included potential expansion, enhance memberships for certain programs, and adjusting operating hours. He noted that the Board and the Friendship Center Operating Board (FCOB) both agreed that what needed to be done next was to find out what the membership and users are looking for. He noted that he is in the process of getting the online membership up and running. He noted that the other three issues also need to be discussed amongst the building users.

Mr. Luetchford noted that he provided a copy of the survey to the Board in their packet, noting that staff would like to move forward with sending out thousands of these surveys to its members and users. He noted that the survey can be completed online or a hard copy would be provided.. He noted that there is also room for people to add their own comments as well. He noted that the survey will ask the basic membership information for gender, age, etc.; asking a variety of questions that will craft a variety of questions with the FCOB and Board. He noted that the FCOB will review the survey one more time this upcoming Monday before releasing it.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he wanted the Board to see the survey prior to releasing it, noting that he would not have wanted the Board to be questioned about it without having viewed it ahead of time. Mr. Seeds noted that the survey has been released. Mr. Wolfe answered no, it was not, it will be within the next few weeks. He noted that this is pretty much the final form.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the FCOB has had any discussions in regards to having adult hours at the end of the day. Mr. Luetchford noted that there is a space on the form for comments in general and there are some questions about operating hours on Friday and Saturday night. He noted that there is also some consideration about eliminating hours because of light use. He noted that no decisions have been made in this regard.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he hopes that the survey will help to narrow down the issues that are important to those who use the facility and then dig deeper into the issues that have been raised. He noted that this is the first of a two-step process.

Mr. Hawk noted that the survey is very comprehensive. Mr. Luetchford noted that it will lead to more discussions but he wanted to limit it to no more than two pages as many more questions could have been asked.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned what the return date for completing the surveys is. Mr. Luetchford noted that it will be decided this week.

#### Adjournment

Mr. Hornung made a motion to adjourn the meeting and the meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle  
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

William L. Hornung  
Township Secretary