

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop Meeting held January 13, 2015

A workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6:11 p.m. by Chairman William B. Hawk, on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

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

Also in attendance was George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steven Stine, Township Solicitor; Jay Wenger and John Hewlett, Susquehanna Group Advisors; Diane Geise and Maryliz Todaro, Meadowview Village; and David Johnson, Public Safety Director;

**Pledge of Allegiance**

Ms. Lindsey led in the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Public Comment**

Presentation by Susquehanna Group Advisors on the  
potential to refund certain 2009 General Obligation Bonds

Mr. Hawk explained that Mike Bova, from Boenning and Scattergood, was on the phone by way of teleconference to take part in the discussion. He noted that Jay Wenger from Susquehanna Group Advisors is at the podium to make a presentation regarding the refunding of a 2009 General Obligation Bond.

Mr. Wenger explained that there is an opportunity to refinance the 2009 C Bonds that have an outstanding balance of \$14,335,000. He noted that the bond was issued by the Township as a general obligation bond for Authority work. He noted that the benefit of saving would go into the Authority budget and not the Township's budget.

Mr. Wenger explained that the 2009 C Bonds become callable starting April 1, 2015, and every day past the call date, the Township pays a higher rate noting that the average rate for the outstanding bonds is 4.105% with the average life remaining on the bonds of ten years. He proposes to refinance the bonds with a closing date on or about March 15, 2015. He noted that

the current estimated Municipal Market Rate as of January 9<sup>th</sup> was 2.745%. He noted that this action would not extend the debt service as it would remain at ten years. He noted that there are two ways to take the saving, similar to a home mortgage where the savings would be the same for each fiscal year, noting that it would be \$115,000 each year in the budget moving forward or the savings would be forced into the years 2015 through 2020. He noted that many municipalities want the savings earlier than later. He noted that the Authority is in the process of many projects and it may want to force the savings into the early years, providing more budget relief for the debt that it is taking on for all the projects that have been financed to date and will be in future years. He noted that the decision does not have to be made tonight.

Mr. Wenger noted that Mr. Bova provided the next three pages in the presentation with page one providing a chart for the Bond Buyer 20 Index for 1979 through 2014. He explained that it shows the index of high grade long-term tax exempt bonds, hitting the 40 year low in 2013. He noted that we are very close to that same low today. He explained that this would be an outstanding opportunity to refinance the existing debt and realize significant savings. He noted if the Board was to proceed, based upon the January 9<sup>th</sup> rate, the savings rate would be about \$1.4 million to \$1.5 million. He noted that it is about a 10% savings. He stated that a 3% savings would be the normal time to take action on refinancing and the rate now is 10%.

Mr. Wenger noted that the second chart shows the bond index for the past 12 months. He noted in the last month there has been another significant drop in the index rate. He noted that the recent drop in the price of oil and US Treasury Bonds has created a renewed interest in tax exempt bonds.

Mr. Wenger noted that page three provides information that over time the interest rates have been lower than they are today, less than .091% and higher by 99.177%. He explained that he does not know where the rates will be tomorrow or next week but this is a good opportunity to refinance the existing debt. He noted that there is a strong demand for AA2 rated bonds in the marketplace and in particular for municipalities like Lower Paxton Township.

Mr. Wenger noted that it would take two to three weeks to get a rating in place which would put the process into early February to come back with a bond purchase agreement,

allowing him to close in early or mid-March. He noted that the new bonds would replace the Series C of 2009 bonds.

Mr. Wenger noted that he would want to meet with the Authority Board, although most of the membership is present except for two additional Authority board members to make sure that it would meet their expectations. He noted that the savings would be between \$1.4 million and \$1.5 million but he cannot say that it is the absolute best for the next coming weeks but it a very attractive opportunity to access lower interest rates for a refunding.

Mr. Wenger noted that he provided additional information and statistics for the Board to review. He noted if the Board elects to wait he would continue to monitor the market, but if he receives the go ahead to proceed he will start working tomorrow to get the rating process going. He noted once the rating is received, the process would be in place to issue bonds. He noted that Mr. Tom Smida is not present but he was included in the discussion and is aware of what is going on and had no negative comments toward moving ahead.

Mr. Hawk questioned if Mr. Bova had any questions for Mr. Wenger. Mr. Bova noted that he could not hear Mr. Wenger but he suggested that the Board move ahead with the process. He noted that the tax exempt rates have not declined as much as the treasury rates have. He noted in the last four to five weeks, the 10-year treasury has declined from 2.4 to a 1.9% yield. He noted that it is a 20% decrease in yields and increase in price. He noted that the treasury market has not kept pace with that so it is possible that there could be some additional move on the tax exempt side but we have seen over the year that they really haven't moved in tandem. He noted that the tax exempt rates have led the taxable rates. He noted that it shows that the tax exempt rates are been higher over 99% of the time for the last 20 years and have only been lower for the 7/10 of 1% of the time. He noted that we are in a very attractive time to refinance the bonds and many refunding's are being brought to the market each week. He noted that it is unknown how long these rates will be sustained but there have been no world events or natural disasters that would cause the rate to spike back up.

Mr. Hornung questioned if we could get this done faster than three weeks and shorten the process. Mr. Wenger answered that three weeks is a realistic time-frame as the Township has to get in the queue for the rating agencies. He noted that it takes three or four days to get the

information together, schedule a time with the rating agency to have Mr. Wolfe on the call, noting that any of the Board members could participate if they chose to. He noted that the rating agency would meet as a committee to make a decision for a rating. He noted that many municipalities are contemplating the same thing. Mr. Hornung noted the faster we get in the queue and beat the other municipalities to the marketplace, the better chance of getting a good rate. He noted if anything can be done to speed up the process that would be good. Mr. Wenger noted that the Board has a meeting next week and it could adopt a parameters resolution which would be done to comply with the State Law. He noted that it would allow Mr. Wenger, once he has received the rating, to be in the market, so the Board would approve the financing before we are ready to market bonds. He noted he could pick up ten days to two weeks in the process.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the Board could do this. Mr. Wolfe answered yes as long as he has the resolution prepared in time. Mr. Wenger noted that he would advertise it and work with Mr. Smida to get this done in time for the next meeting. He noted that we would need to meet with the Authority Board. Mr. Hornung noted that we could call an emergency meeting of the Authority Board to do this.

Mr. Wenger noted that the resolution won't commit Boenning and Scattergood or the Board to anything but it would provide an authorization to move into the process. Mr. Wenger questioned if Mr. Bova had any objections to that. Mr. Bova answered no, noting that he would prefer a parameters resolution so he is not tied to the market noting if the Board provides a benchmark savings, we can work with that. He noted that it provides flexibility based upon other deals that are coming to the marketplace to determine when to bring the issue to the marketplace, based upon the Board's threshold.

Mr. Wenger noted if the market was to move against the Township, the Board would have the opportunity at the time they access the market to make sure everyone is still on board with the decision that the savings would meet its expectation.

Mr. Hawk thanked Mr. Bova and Mr. Wenger for bringing this to the Board's attention. Mr. Wenger noted that he would be in touch with Mr. Smida tomorrow.

Continued discussion with the Meadowview Village Homeowners  
Association regarding the status of the subdivision plan

Diane Geise, President and Liz Todaro, Secretary of the Meadow Village Homeowners Association (HOA) were present to discuss the status of the subdivision plan. Ms. Todaro noted that she brought along some documents if the Board needs to view them. Mr. Wolfe noted that he provided the Board with Ms. Geise's most recent letter, and his letter, and they have viewed, in the past, all the correspondence in regards to this matter.

Ms. Todaro noted after the HOA received the December 4<sup>th</sup> letter from Mr. Wolfe and they were confused since they did not believe that they had the responsibility for the development plan. She noted that was not their intent. She explained that she called Mr. Wolfe to find out why the HOA had received the letter and not the developer. She noted that the HOA found out that they had presented their amendment request incorrectly. She noted that they sent the letter of clarification to the Board. She noted that the declaration for the HOA provides that any amendments to the plan must have a 67% rate of approval of the unit owners. She noted that the HOA proceeded to get those votes. She explained that the developer provided the HOA with a letter that they submitted to the Township asking for the changes in the plan. She noted that the developer was going to assume all responsibilities as they are supposed to for the continued development of the plan as there are certain things that remain to be completed. She noted that it was never the intent of the HOA to assume responsibility for the plan. She noted that the HOA's responsibility is to see what the unit owners want and act accordingly and work with the developer to proceed with that. She noted that the unit owners would prefer not to have the continuation of the walking path as it poses safety problems as it falls behinds homes, and poses privacy problems. She noted that they continue to believe that the retention wall that was not built by the developer in 2009 caused further problems. She noted that it is still the developer's, who at this point is Cornerstone, responsibility to proceed with the plan. She questioned what the HOA should do at this time to rectify the issue.

Ms. Geise noted that the HOA came before the Board to get waivers on the plan, one to provide more parking area for the development and to eliminate the walking path. She noted that the Board approved those waivers. She noted that the retaining wall continues to be the big issue.

She noted that the Township's engineer continues to believe that the retaining wall should be put in and the HOA received a letter informing it that it was the HOA's responsibility to put that in. She noted that it is the builder's responsibility so that is the dilemma that she is having here. She stated that the Township, in 2009, conducted an inspection and in a letter it states that the retaining wall still needs to be installed. She noted that it has not been installed and that was back in 2009. She noted that it is the builder's responsibility, not the HOA. She noted if the Board decides that the retention wall needs to be put in, then it is the builder's responsibility. She noted that the HOA's architectural engineer stated that the ground should not be disturbed as it has mature growth and vegetation on it now and he would not disturb it since they had the two homes that collapsed.

Mr. Hawk questioned if units 187 and 188 have been repaired. Ms. Todaro noted that the two units were never in jeopardy of collapsing, rather the interior floors started to sag even though the exterior walls were on solid ground. She noted that the unit owners were out of their homes for about two months each and they are now back in their homes. She noted that they had to put fill in the middle of their homes where they had settled and the ground was not tamped down enough so the sewer lines and other items needed to be repaired as well as those problems internal to the structure.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that Ms. Todaro keeps saying that it is up to the builder to put the wall in, then why didn't the builder come to the Board to ask not to have the walking paths and to add more parking spaces. She noted that the HOA came and asked for those waivers, not that the HOA took the responsibility for those two actions but why don't you want to take responsibility for the wall. Ms. Todaro answered that she was not sure that they were taking responsibility for anything, we were submitting information to the Township to indicate that we did have a majority of the unit owners who wanted to change the plan. She noted that the builder gave her the letter to submit to the Township, and they led us to believe that we needed to submit it since we now have an association. She noted that the association was not formed until about 2009 because the developer was to assume responsibility for the day-to-day operations until 80% of the units were built.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that you don't want to put the wall in because you have a percentage of the homeowners who are saying that they don't want the wall there. Ms. Todaro answered that it is more than that. She noted that the HOA did not know that the wall was supposed to be constructed as it doesn't take responsibility for the plan and how it is developed. She noted when the HOA approached the developer about a year and a half ago and said that there are funds set aside for a walking path that we believe that most of the unit owners do not want and could the HOA take those funds and put them into parking that is sorely needed. She noted that the developer was fine with that and they started looking at the hill behind Units 187 and 188 and that is when it first came to the HOA attention that there should be a retaining wall constructed. Mrs. Lindsey questioned what year was that. Ms. Todaro answered that it was last fall. Ms. Lindsey noted that you mentioned a letter from 2009. Ms. Todaro explained that letter was from HRG to the Township. Mr. Wolfe noted that letter is an annual inspection report for an improvement guarantee that noted that the retaining wall had not been constructed yet. Ms. Todaro noted that she met with the developer in November of 2013 and that is when it came to their attention about the retaining wall. She noted that the developer drafted that letter for the HOA that we submitted to the Township in February of 2014. She noted that Mr. Wolfe pointed out, at that time, that the HOA needed to do a survey for the votes for the unit owners to show what they wanted to have done. She noted that she submitted the survey results to the Township in April of 2014 and then they wanted additional information for why the retaining wall should not be put in noting that the engineer was working on the issues with Units 187 and 188. She noted that they asked Mr. Yingst and he stated that the retaining wall should not be put in. She noted that the Township's engineer, Steve Fleming, was present at the meeting, and he indicated that the ground was settled and that the only reason that Mr. Fleming continued to state that the wall should be constructed was because of the slope ratio and that a waiver could be applied for but it would have to be granted by the Board. She suggested that was Mr. Fleming's primary reason for continuing with his recommendation.

Mr. Hawk noted that the HOA feels that the wall does not need to be constructed by a vote of your association; however, the Township Engineer's stand is that the wall should be constructed, and you have a builder that does not want to put in the wall. Ms. Todaro noted if

the Township decides that the wall needs to be installed, it is the developer's responsibility as they failed to do it in 2001 through 2009. She noted to say now that the HOA has responsibility for this when we never resumed responsibility for building things; it has always been the developer's responsibility and needs to fall back on them.

Mr. Hawk questioned what you want from the Board. Ms. Geise answered that we are looking for a waiver not to put the retention wall in. Ms. Todaro noted that the waiver would have to go to both the developer as well as the HOA since it is the developer's responsibility if the waiver is not granted.

Mr. Hawk noted that if the Board grants a waiver and something happens the Board would be on the hook for granting something and the developer is on the hook since he was supposed to install it and is refusing to do it and the HOA is sitting in the middle.

Ms. Todaro noted that the ground is stable and has been since 2008 and 2009 and if we start messing with it... Ms. Geise noted that is exactly what Mr. Yingst, the engineer who corrected the problem for units 187 and 188 stated. Mr. Hawk noted that he is not qualified to speak to that issue. Ms. Todaro noted that it is a dilemma but putting the retaining wall in is not the HOA's responsibly, it is the developers'.

Mr. Hawk questioned how you force the developer to do the work. Mr. Stine noted that you would take the funds from the Improvement Guarantee. Mr. Seeds noted that there are no funds bonded to do the wall. Mr. Wolfe noted that it was never bonded, but noted as a plan improvement. Mr. Stine noted that you have to enforce the plan. Mr. Seeds noted that it is the developer's responsibility.

Ms. Lindsey questioned Ms. Geise if she had contacted the developer. Ms. Geise noted not only for this but also for the paving of the roads which he hasn't done for ten years. She noted that she has sent him letter after letter to get this done. Ms. Todaro noted that you can't get through on a phone line to talk to the developer so everything has to be done through email or hard copy. Ms. Geise noted that we want to get this all wrapped up so we can get the extra parking.

Mr. Seeds noted that this was discussed before at a previous meeting and the Township's engineer, Steve Fleming, stated that the wall needs to be constructed. He noted that is what the

Board has told the HOA that needs to be done. He noted that the Board must rely on its engineer. Ms. Todaro questioned if the engineer is with HRG. Ms. Lindsey answered yes. Ms. Todaro noted that is the one that wrote the letter back in 2009 saying that it was not built and didn't seem to be concerned at that time. Mr. Hornung noted that there is a time period in which the infrastructure needs to be built.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if the HOA has an attorney, suggesting that you should refer this to the attorney to take care of it. Ms. Todaro answered that they have contacted their attorney but he has not gotten back to us. Ms. Geise noted that the reason she came to the meeting is to let the Board know that it is not their responsibility, it is the builder's and we are trying to work it out.

Mr. Seeds noted that it looks like the developer is trying to get the HOA to do his bidding for them. He noted that it would be some savings to the developer if they don't have to put the retaining wall in.

Ms. Todaro questioned how they are going to put a wall in at this point with all the homes back in that location since it is such a small area. She questioned how they would get any equipment in that area to do the work. She noted that it is not going to be any easy thing at this point.

Mr. Hawk questioned who the builder is. Ms. Todaro distributed a sheet explaining the process. Ms. Lindsey questioned if this goes back to the builder or developer. Ms. Todaro answered that they are one in the same. She noted that Continental was the developer and builder. She noted that current developer who is also the builder for a time period is the second one who is Cornerstone. She noted that Continental started the project in 2001 and they built until 2005 building the first 63 units. Then he developed health issues and sold everything to Cornerstone. He noted that Cornerstone built homes and at some point they wanted to get out of the building business but continue on as the developer. She noted that they assigned building rights to Gemcraft and then they entered into Chapter 11 in 2009. She noted that Classic Communities got a majority of the land which was built on the eastern side. She noted that Gemcraft continue to have a vested interest and is building homes near Union Deposit Road. She noted that they are almost done with their building and then Vanguard Reality will be developing

the front lot with 12 additional units. She noted that Cornerstone Meadowview continues to be the developer of record. She noted that he is responsible for doing the roads and anything else on the plan. She noted that the plantings and trees have to be done by the builder and now Cornerstone is coming back in to do the final paving.

Mr. Hawk noted that it seems that Cornerstone is responsible for the work.

Ms. Lindsey noted that the HOA should have their attorney handle this as it is more of a legal issue. Mr. Stine noted that it wouldn't hurt. Ms. Lindsey suggested that the attorney could get more done than Ms. Todaro and Ms. Geise.

Ms. Giese questioned, as a homeowner, who is responsible to have the builder put the retaining wall in. She noted that it is not her responsibility as the homeowner or as the HOA. Mr. Hornung noted that it is the developer who is responsible; however if the Township does not have an improvement guarantee for the retaining wall then the chances are radically reduced that we can force them to do it. He noted that you may weigh the court costs versus the costs to do the work. He noted at this point, the Township does not have as much clout as it normally has to get these things done. He noted that he cannot guarantee that the Township will pursue this legally. Mr. Stine noted that we have the power to enforce the requirements of the plan, but the question is if the Board chooses to do it or not. Mr. Stine noted that you need to contact the developer to tell them that they need to put the retaining wall in.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if we have done that. Mr. Wolfe answered that he notified the HOA since they represented that they were the ones that applied for subdivision and land development plan amendments. He noted that they were notified that the wall had to be installed since they were the ones who requested that the wall be removed.

Mr. Stine noted when the HOA was told by the developer that 67% of you have to agree to the amendment, they assumed that they were responsible for doing the amendment, not only getting the votes which was not true. He noted that is how this got messed up.

Ms. Geise noted that the Board does not want to pursue the retaining wall situation for financial reasons and the same goes for the HOA. Mr. Hornung noted that he did not say that the Board would not follow through with this, only that he was not sure. He noted that the Township will take the first step in requesting that the developer comply; however if he doesn't then the

Board has to make a decision for how important it is, what the costs will be, and then determine if it will proceed with legal action. He noted that the developer would not want to be dragged into court either so there is more to it than having the Township battle this out.

Mr. Hawk questioned if Cornerstone is still around. Ms. Todaro noted that we have to contact them by way of email, sometimes they respond and sometimes they don't.

Mr. Hawk questioned how much it would cost to do the retaining wall. Mr. Wolfe answered that it was under \$10,000.

Mr. Hornung questioned if we have an amendment to the plan for the removal of the walking trail and additional parking. Mr. Wolfe answered yes if the plan amendment was properly submitted. He noted that is a question for Mr. Stine. Mr. Hornung requested Mr. Stine to investigate that. He noted if the amendment is correct then we need to make some changes to the improvement guarantee. Mr. Seeds noted that the work has already been done. Ms. Geise answered that it has not been done. Ms. Todaro explained that the developer said that they would do it at the time they pave the roads which is to be done this spring.

Status report regarding the establishment of a  
K-9 unit in the Police Department

Public Safety Director (PSD) David Johnson stated that he submitted a memo to Mr. Wolfe providing a timeline for the implementation of the K-9 Program in the Police Department. He noted that this is assuming that everything falls into place, that no further people go off on leave for an extended period of time, depending on when the dog is transported to the United States, and that we are able to find the right dog. He noted that he will issue a general order announcing the position, and although one officer spearheaded this program it must be offered to all the members of the Department. He noted the last date to submit a letter will be January 30, 2015.

PSD Johnson explained that he will conduct interviews the first week of February and make a determination for who the officer will be. He noted that we need to find someone who is a self-starter, regularly attends work, works well in the community, has a good understanding for how to conduct criminal investigations, is in good physical condition, and will have a significant

interest in being as good a handler for a canine as he can be. He noted that we can have the best dog in the world but if we have a bad handler we will have a bad dog and if we have an average dog but a great handler we will have a good canine program.

PSD Johnson noted that he is currently working on a canine policy, obtaining policies from other departments that have a canine program noting that he received one from Chief Frank Williamson of Lower Allen Township Police Department who started a canine program last year. He noted that he plans to implement the policy in February and about March 9<sup>th</sup>, Mr. Cassel will travel to Europe to get 30 to 40 dogs. He noted that the handler will go to Cassel's facility in Mechanicsburg to be introduced to all the dogs, and their staff will assist the officer in finding the best dog for our officer. He noted once the dog and handler have been matched, the officer will take the dog with him for about a month to see if they bond. He noted that staff from Cassel's K-9 Inc., will ensure that the dog and officer have bonded, if not, the process will start all over again. He noted if all goes according to the plan, the officer will start a four week training period at Cassel's K-9 Inc., on April 13<sup>th</sup> with the officer starting his duties on May 11<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. Hawk questioned if he was looking at the all-inclusive plan for the purchase of the dog. PSD Johnson answered that at a minimum he was looking at the preferred level for a patrol narcotics dog or the all-inclusive level noting that the price difference is for additional equipment. He noted that the all-inclusive level includes the outdoor kennel that is movable.

Mr. Hawk noted that he was at the farm show and stopped to talk to a dog handler. He noted that he had nothing but praise for Cassel's K-9 Inc. He noted that the handler had a narcotics dog and he lives in Lancaster and works there as well as Dauphin County. He noted that he bought his dog from Cassel's for a very low price and then trained the dog for narcotics. He noted as we started to talk a young lady walked down the aisle and the dog stood up and followed her for as long as his leash would allow. He noted the handler could not do anything about what the dog found as he was not working at that time. He provided the gentlemen's card to PSD Johnson in the event he would want to touch base with him.

PSD Johnson noted that our dog could do narcotics, building searches, and crime control. He noted that we are looking at a dog that is less than 24 months old that has been identified as a working dog in Europe. He noted that he was directed to look at the German Shepherd or the

Belgian Malinois/shepherd cross but not to go with a Belgian Malinois since we would be fitting a dog for a first-time handler. He noted that the Belgian Malinois is a very high-strung active animal and it might be too much for a first-time handler.

Mr. Seeds noted that PSD Johnson mentioned a moveable outdoor kennel, and he questioned if the dog would be kept outdoors instead of inside the handler's home. PSD Johnson answered that the dog would be kept in the home of the handler but the kennel could be used by the handler when he is at work to allow the handler to put the dog outside here at the office for a short period of time. He noted that the kennel could also be put in the receiving area inside the building. Mr. Seeds noted that the other equipment was an insert in the vehicle for an SUV for the dog. PSD Johnson noted that it is all part of the price included with the dog. Mr. Seeds noted that PSD Johnson has selected the level according to the needs of the Township. PSD Johnson noted that the price includes the dog, four-week training, leashes, bite suit, other training aids, insert for the vehicle, and also the kennel.

Mr. Seeds noted that the dog would do patrol and narcotics work. He questioned if we would be looking for an explosives dog. PSD Johnson noted that it would be an option but would entail much more money. He noted if you train a dog in too many things they may not be as good if they are only trained in two options such as patrol and narcotics. He noted that we do not have a good reason to purchase an explosives dog. Mr. Seeds suggested that the State Police would have a dog trained in explosives. PSD Johnson noted that we have called PSP if we had any bomb incidents in the past. He noted that he would not recommend training a dog in patrol, narcotics and explosives.

Mr. Hawk noted that he was surprised that the training is only for four weeks. PSD Johnson explained that it is just the first round of training noting that they have to attend additional training for two days every month.

Ms. Lindsey noted that residents have contacted her about contributions for the dog. She questioned if we can accept them. PSD Johnson answered that the Police Department has an account for donations and people can donate to the Police Department to the canine program. He noted in talking to other departments, Chief Martin had a canine program and donations made to his fund were tax deductible.

Mr. Seeds noted that Susquehanna Township does not have a dog anymore. PSD Johnson answered that was correct. Ms. Lindsey noted that Derry Township has four dogs. PSD Johnson noted that PSP has dogs at the Academy in Hershey and the City of Harrisburg has dogs as well.

Ms. Lindsey noted that it is very exciting for the Township and the residents and it will be a good PR tool in the schools. She noted that she was also at the Farm Show last night and they had a PSP dog there. She noted that it was very interactive with the children and it is time to do this since we have borrowed dogs from other departments on numerous occasions. She thanked PSD Johnson for taking on this task.

#### “Otta Know Presentations

##### Act 164 of 2014 requiring the elected tax collector to appoint a deputy

Mr. Wolfe noted, at the end of 2014, two pieces of legislation came into effect, the first was Act 164 of 2014 which requires all property tax collectors to be qualified in accordance with a certain process. He noted that incumbent tax collectors are automatically grandfathered as qualified but there will be annual training requirements that they will have to attend. He noted in accordance with Act 164, tax collectors must receive a certification of qualification from the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development and they must provide the municipality with a copy of that certification. He noted that they must go through a continuing education process conducted by the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development. He noted that the elected tax collector must appoint a deputy tax collector and they must be presented to and approved by the County, School District and municipality.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he was providing this information to the Board noting that he should be receiving a form to be signed from the tax collector by the Board. He noted as time goes on the elected tax collector should be providing information to the Board on her continuing education as required by law.

Mr. Seeds questioned when the law came into effect. Mr. Wolfe answered this year. He noted that registration for the continuing education classes starts February 1, 2015. Mr. Seeds questioned when she had to appoint the deputy tax collector. Mr. Wolfe answered that it was 30

days from the beginning of the year. Ms. Lindsey questioned if the tax collector is aware of these changes and requirements. Mr. Wolfe answered that she participates in the State Tax Collector's Association and they would be providing information to her.

Mr. Seeds noted that we had an issue in the past with a tax collector. Mr. Wolfe noted that she died while in office. Mr. Seeds noted that this will fix that situation.

Ms. Lindsey noted if we don't hear anything by the middle of February we should contact the tax collector to find out what is going on. She noted that we could also ask for a copy of the certification if we have not received it by that time.

#### Act 89 of 2014; the Green Light Go Program

Mr. Wolfe noted that Rep. Ron Marsico provided information to the Township from PennDOT in regards to grant funding that is available through PENNDOT. He noted that it is the second round of their traffic signal funding program commonly referred to as Green Light Go. He noted that the first round was a small amount that provided \$1.8 million state-wide; however the second round is \$25 million with the application period open through to February 27, 2015.

Mr. Wolfe noted projects that are eligible for funding include capital facilities for the improvement of traffic signals, LED programs for lights (noting that we have already converted our traffic signals), and timing systems to interconnect traffic signal systems. He noted that the Township has benefited from increased traffic signal funding in that the entire Route 22 corridor will receive a complete capital facility upgrade so that the timing of signals operates in a much better fashion and the corridors will be timed from the city of Harrisburg out to the end of Lower Paxton Township. He noted that the corridor out from the City of Harrisburg to the west through to the Carlisle Pike is also being timed in the same manner and the system that is being installed is referred to as the Adaptive Traffic Signal System.

Mr. Wolfe explained as part of the Adaptive Traffic Signal Program, PennDOT replaced the cabinet box at Route 22 and Shannon Drive today. He noted when they did this they had to turn off all the power to the intersection leaving the traffic direction to be done with directional signage. He noted that the conversion of a signal box can take 30 minutes to an hour. He noted that they are planning to do these during low traffic peak times. He noted that they plan to

change the cabinet at the intersection of Route 22 and Blue Ribbon Avenue next, and will be doing the intersections along Route 22 at Devonshire Road, Byron Street, Prince Street, Miller Road, and Colonial Road.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township's upgrade of traffic signal facilities by PENNDOT on Route 22 are in the process and the Township will be investigating specific grant funding opportunities in accordance with the Green Light Go Program as sponsored by the new State Legislation, Act 89 of 2014.

Mr. Seeds questioned if they are using these monies now. Mr. Wolfe answered the current project is being funded by other funds. Mr. Seeds questioned what would the Township apply for. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it would use funds for capital facilities, as many of the intersections need to be upgraded from span wire to mast arms. He noted that we need new signal heads as well. Mr. Seeds suggested that we should have better traffic flow when this project is completed. Mr. Wolfe answered yes.

Mr. Hornung noted that Mr. Robbins included signal upgrades as part of the five-year strategic plan. Mr. Wolfe noted that we have some funding available in the General Improvement Fund this year that we could use to match a Green Light Go Grant and do about \$100,000 worth of a project which could fund a small intersection. He noted that eventually we want to replace all the span wire that holds the traffic signal to provide mast arms.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if the signals were replaced at Prince Street as they have different colors than the older ones. Mr. Wolfe answered that we could have replaced signal heads, as they fail over time and we do a biennial inspection of all signal facilities. He noted if one or more have failed, we will replace them.

Mr. Seeds questioned if they will be doing all the intersections on Route 22. Mr. Wolfe answered that they are doing all the intersections for timing along Route 22 and about half of the cabinets. He noted that the other cabinets are big enough to reuse. Mr. Seeds noted that they will put new equipment in the cabinets and it should be done sometime in the early spring.

## **Adjournment**

With there being no other business, Ms. Lindsey made a motion to adjourn the meeting and the meeting adjourned at 7:22 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle  
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

William L. Hornung  
Township Secretary