

**LOWER PROVIDENCE TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
APRIL 15, 2010 MEETING MINUTES**

1) Executive Session:

- a) Mr. DiPaolo motioned to call the executive session to order at 6:30 p.m., seconded by Mrs. Altieri. The following Supervisors were present: Mr. Brown, Mrs. Altieri, Mr. DiPaolo, Mrs. Eckman, and Mr. Thomas. Also present were Township Manager Mr. Dunbar and Solicitor Mr. Sheridan. A discussion took place on legal, personnel and real estate matters. Upon motion by Mr. Thomas, seconded by Mrs. Eckman, the session adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

2) Public Meeting: Call to Order

- a) Chairman Brown called the public meeting to order at 7:33 p.m.

3) Pledge of Allegiance

4) Roll Call:

- a) The following members were present: Supervisors Altieri, Brown, DiPaolo, Eckman and Thomas.
- b) Also present were Solicitor Michael Sheridan, Township Engineer John Chambers, Police Chief Francis Carroll, Public Works Director David Shaffer, Human Resources Coordinator Geri Golas, Community Relations Coordinator Denise Walsh, Director of Special Projects and Technology William Roth, and Township Manager Joseph Dunbar.

5) Chairman's Comments:

- a) Chairman Brown announced that an executive session was held prior to the meeting to discuss legal and real estate matters.

6) Public Participation:

- a) There was no public participation at this point in the meeting.

7) Consent Agenda:

- a) Approval of the consent agenda items 1a through 1c, inclusive of the meeting minutes from April 1, 2010:
 - i) Supervisor Altieri noted that she approved of the consent agenda with the exception of payment of check #53483 in the amount of \$1,200 to Butera, Beausang, Cohen & Brennan. Supervisor Eckman commented that she also is not voting for this one check.
 - ii) **MOTION** – Supervisor DiPaolo made a motion to accept the consent agenda items 1a through 1c, including the meeting minutes for April 1, 2010. Supervisor Thomas seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 5-0.

8) Presentations & Commendations:

- a) Presentation to Sgt. James Crawford on 25 years of service with the Lower Providence Township Police Department:
 - i) Chairman Brown provided an overview of Sgt. James Crawford's educational & career background, noting significant recognition he has received in the line of duty, and thanking him for 25 years of service with the LPPD. Chief Carroll presented Sgt. Crawford with a plaque and gold watch in appreciation for his 25 years of service to the Township.
- b) Presentation to Sgt. David Matthews on 25 years of service with the Lower Providence Township Police Department:
 - i) Chairman Brown provided an overview of Sgt. David Matthews' educational & career background, noting significant recognition he has received in the line of duty, and thanking him for 25 years of service with the LPPD. Chief Carroll presented Sgt. Matthews with a plaque and gold watch in appreciation for his 25 years of service to the Township.
- c) Presentation of Distinguished Unit Citation to Det. Michael Jackson, Off. W. Timothy Arthur, Off. Charles King and Off. Peter Fleming for the actions of December 1, 2009:

- i) Chief Carroll presented Distinguished Unit Citations to Detective Michael Jackson, and Officers Timothy Arthur, Charles King and Peter Fleming for their efforts in the prevention of a suicide attempt the night of December 1, 2009.
- ii) Chief Carroll provided an overview of that evening's events, where the subject was prepared to jump off the bridge for the Rt. 422 overpass. Officer Fleming was the first responder to the scene, and kept the suspect engaged in conversation through the course of events. Officer Arthur assisted with closing traffic down on Rt. 422 in that area, and Officer King assisted with shutting down traffic on S. Trooper Road. Detective Jackson approached the suspect from behind and was able to pull him to safety.
- iii) Both Chief Carroll and Chairman Brown congratulated these men for their success in handling this situation.
- d) Presentation of Commendation of Merit to Off. Robert M. Heim for his actions of January 4, 2010:
 - i) Chief Carroll presented a Commendation of Merit to Officer Robert M. Heim for actions taken while off-duty on January 4, 2010.
 - ii) Chief Carroll explained that Officer Heim was working out at an exercise facility when he witnessed Mr. Robert Morath fall to the floor in an unconscious state. Officer Heim proceeded to use CPR on Mr. Morath until initial responding officers arrived and Mr. Morath began breathing on his own.
 - iii) Mr. Morath was present and thanked Officer Heim on behalf of both he and his wife.
- e) Public Comment:
 - i) There was no public comment on this portion of the agenda.

9) New Business:

- a) Discussion of Service Request Tracking System by Community Relations Coordinator Denise Walsh:
 - i) Mrs. Walsh provided a demonstration of the Service Request Tracking System (SRTS) that the Township has been using since February 2009. The SRTS is designed to track concerns or problems that come into the Township by integrating them into the Township's Geographic Information System (GIS). Carrigan GEO Services developed this system for the Township.
 - ii) Mrs. Walsh explained that Township staff view concerns from residents and business as service requests that need to be addressed. She used a sample service request to show how requests are entered into the system, linked to residents properties (in most cases), and how the appropriate departments are notified that there is an issue they need to address. Once entered into the SRTS, an email is generated to the person accountable for addressing the service request, and the email contains a link to the open service request in the system for quick reference.
 - iii) Documents such as plans or letters relating to the matter can be attached to the service request in the system. This provides a central, easily accessible location for all information relating to the service request. Reports can be generated by day, month, department etc. to view the service requests.
 - iv) Chairman Brown asked what happened when a matter was closed? Mrs. Walsh noted that it stays in the system so there is a record of what transpired.
 - v) Mr. Brown asked Mr. Tim Carrigan of Carrigan GEO Services how a resident would be notified if a Board Member put in a request for them. He explained that often residents do not want to be identified with an issue so they call a Supervisor and ask them to call it in.
 - (1) Mrs. Walsh noted they could call up any request and provide an update.
 - (2) Mr. Carrigan stated that they could send an email to the Supervisor when action is taken or an item is closed. They would need to modify the system but could add this in.
 - (3) Supervisor Altieri clarified that if a Board member generated a service request they could get direct feedback. Mr. Carrigan confirmed this could occur.
 - vi) Mr. Dunbar noted this system was an original system designed for the Township. Mrs. Altieri commented that it was very thorough and they did a nice job on it.
 - vii) Public Comment:
 - (1) There was no public comment on this item.

- b) Discussion and consideration on Township employee laptop procedures:
- i) Mrs. Golas explained that this policy outlines procedures for the Township management team members who have been issued corporate laptops as part of the business continuity plan in case of an emergency. These employees are encouraged to take computers home with them and secure them every day. This will become part of the personnel policy manual.
 - ii) Chairman Brown commented that the Board members use their own computers, and are not issued computers by the Township.
 - iii) **MOTION** – Supervisor DiPaolo made a motion to incorporate this into the Personnel Policy Manual as amended. Supervisor Thomas seconded the motion. The motion *passed 5-0*.
 - iv) Public Comment:
 - (1) There was no public comment on this item.
- c) Discussion and consideration on letter of support to Sen. Arlen Specter in regards to Valley Forge National Historical Park:
- i) Chairman Brown read a letter to be submitted to Senator Arlen Specter regarding appropriation of funds for rehabilitation of the Visitor Center at the Valley Forge National Historical Park, and the Board's support of this effort.
 - ii) Supervisor Eckman asked what spurred this letter, and why is it not going to Congressman Sestak? Mr. Brown explained that the Park is trying to do some upgrades, and Senator Specter is still working on appropriations for this budget where Congressman Sestak is done.
 - iii) **MOTION** – Supervisor Eckman made a motion to send the letter of support to Sen. Specter. Supervisor Altieri seconded the motion. The motion *passed 5-0*.
 - iv) Public Comment:
 - (1) There was no public comment on this item.
- d) Discussion and consideration on Masterson drainage swale rework – 3837 Vincent Drive:
- i) Mr. Shaffer explained that this request is to repair a drainage swale that the Township relocated two years ago. Erosion has caused the swale to change shape and the resident has requested that the Township re-contour it so there is no ponding. The swale is within the Township easement. This will cost \$800 for erosion fabric, seed, lime and fertilizer, and will require two days of work from Public Works personnel.
 - ii) **MOTION** – Supervisor DiPaolo made a motion to proceed with the project as outlined in Mr. Shaffer's April 7, 2010 letter. Supervisor Eckman seconded the motion. The motion *passed 5-0*.
 - iii) Mr. Shaffer noted he would ask the resident to sign a release allowing them to perform work on their property.
 - iv) Public Comment:
 - (1) There was no public comment on this item.
- e) Discussion and consideration of the inclusion of an extension agreement with the subdivision and land development (SALDO) application:
- i) Mr. Chambers explained that the Municipal Planning Code requires the Township to review and take action on SALDO applications within 90 days of submission. However, with the amount of outside reviews required for each application, they are rarely completed within the 90-day timeframe.
 - ii) The extension agreement allows an applicant to waive the 90-day rule at the time of submission so that the Township does not have to go back to them to obtain the signature later. This is not a mandatory agreement, and it says that either party can institute the 90-day rule to begin the 90-day clock at any point during the review process. This is a housekeeping item and Mr. Chambers indicated that at least half of the municipalities use similar extension agreements.
 - iii) Supervisor Altieri confirmed that this is a totally optional agreement. Mr. Chambers affirmed this.
 - (1) Mrs. Altieri asked what would happen if an applicant does not sign this document? Mr. Chambers explained that the Township then tracks the 90-day clock and has to request that the applicant submit an extension letter as the 90-day timeframe nears.

- (2) Mrs. Altieri asked if the Township does not request the extension, would the application be deemed approved? Mr. Chambers indicated that it would.
- (3) Mrs. Altieri asked if other Township's have this? Mr. Chambers indicated that this is not his idea; it is an example of how the other municipalities do it.
- iv) Mr. DiPaolo reiterated to the audience that if, during land development, the Township fails to take action within 90 days the plan is deemed approved.
- v) **MOTION** – Supervisor DiPaolo made a motion to include the extension agreement in the SALDO application. Supervisor Thomas seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 4-1. Supervisor Altieri opposed the motion.
- vi) Public Comment:
 - (1) There was no public comment on this item.
- f) Discussion and consideration on revisions to new submittal plan checklist procedures recommended by Chambers Associates:
 - i) Mr. Chambers explained that when submitting a Subdivision and Land Development (SALDO) application the applicant is required to submit a copy of the checklist procedures. They have made some minor changes to the checklist for the Board's approval.
 - ii) Mr. Chambers outlined the changes as follows:
 - (1) When the applicant posts the property they must now submit a photograph of the posting showing the sign in place on the property.
 - (2) They must indicate if they signed a waiver of the 90-day requirement.
 - (3) Once the plan has gone to the Board of Supervisors, the applicant must ensure they send it to all of the appropriate consultants for review.
 - (4) All consultants must issue clean review letters.
 - (5) The plan must also be sent to all appropriate consultants for a final review.
 - (6) The applicant must track and submit cost estimates for escrow.
 - (7) The finalized Land Development Agreement and Financial Security Agreement must be recorded and sent to the Township Engineer.
 - (8) The Title Company is now referenced generically in case this would change.
 - iii) Supervisor Altieri asked if this checklist was just used for Major Land Developments? Mr. Chambers explained that it would be used for any subdivision or land development that was not deminimus.
 - (1) Mrs. Altieri suggested changing the name of the document to include new subdivision plan checklist procedures.
 - (2) Mrs. Altieri asked how you would know if the Township Engineer or Landscape Architect received this list and everything was done? Mr. Chambers indicated that the money stays in escrow after construction and is not returned until everything is completed. This document follows the project through the approval process and post construction.
 - iv) **MOTION** – Supervisor Altieri made a motion to change the name of the document and adopt the revisions. Supervisor DiPaolo seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 5-0.
 - v) Public Comment:
 - (1) There was no public comment on this item.
- g) Authorization for Planning Commission's Course in Community Planning:
 - i) Mrs. Golas explained that the Montgomery County Planning Commission is hosting a "Course in Community Planning" over three evenings. This is a beneficial course for members of the Township's Planning Commission, and costs \$90 per person. Mrs. Golas requested that the Board authorize this training expense, which has been budgeted for 2010.
 - ii) **MOTION** – Supervisor Altieri made a motion to authorize the training expense. Supervisor DiPaolo seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 5-0.
 - iii) Public Comment:
 - (1) There was no public comment on this item.

- h) Discussion and consideration on updated Montgomery County Consortium of Communities Articles of Agreement / Resolution:
- i) Mr. Dunbar noted that the Bylaws for the Montgomery County Consortium of Communities, a manager's group of municipalities, had not been updated since 1993. During a recent review they noticed that only one signature was required on official documents of the Consortium, and they have updated this to require two signatures. Any changes to the Bylaws require the approval of the associated Townships. Mr. Dunbar requested that the Board ratify the change as proposed by the Consortium committee.
 - ii) **MOTION** – Supervisor Altieri made a motion to ratify the by-law change. Supervisor DiPaolo seconded the motion. The motion *passed* 5-0.
 - iii) Public Comment:
 - (1) There was no public comment on this item.
- i) Discussion on Resolution #10-19, regarding the Township Solar Feasibility Study:
- i) Mr. Sheridan noted that the Board previously authorized the Township to proceed with the solar feasibility project and seek the related grant funding for it. As part of this the Township received a proposal from CMX, who will be going out of business in Pennsylvania on May 11, 2010. Because CMX will no longer be in the region, the Township can engage another consultant to handle this study.
 - ii) Mr. Dunbar noted this is for information only; no action is required. He is currently working on the local match requirements and hopes to bring this to the Board during May. They have a meeting with Blue Sky Power next week, are trying to meet the Department of Energy requirements, and working on the match requirement.
 - iii) Public Comment:
 - (1) There was no public comment on this item.
- j) Discussion on amendment to Township Sewer Ordinance:
- i) Mr. Sheridan presented a proposed amendment to the Sewer Ordinance.
 - (1) This refers to I & I, which is Inflow and Infiltration into the sewer system. Inflow is artificial tapping into a building sewer line running from the edge of the street to the house. Sump pumps or leader drains from the rooms will artificially tap into the sewer line and water runoff is treated by the sewer system. Infiltration is where the building sewer line from the curb to the house is not tight by a break or bad connection. Both of these conditions result in unnecessary entry of stormwater into the sewer system.
 - (2) This is significant from both the Township's and Sewer Authorities (SA) view. Meter pits will soon be activated to monitor flow from the Township to the Regional Authority. Regulations required the local SA to reduce I&I. If they do not it can result in additional charges to the SA for additional EDU's, charges for usage, charges for increased flow.
 - (3) Mr. Sheridan noted that the draft amendment defines Infiltration and Inflow.
 - (a) In Section 2 it says that no property owner will allow infiltration or inflow into the sewer line.
 - (b) Section 3 expands the provision as to the building owner or system user's obligation. This includes the permanent installation of sump pumps.
 - (c) Section 4 notes the sewer line must be maintained to prevent any Infiltration or Inflow into the system.
 - ii) Mr. Dunbar fully respects and supports the issues with the Regional Sewer Authority.
 - (1) This issue was raised 16-18 months ago, and they are trying to understand the concerns with regard to inspections. They need to plan how to address problems with sump pumps.
 - (2) Mr. Dunbar recommends having a joint meeting between the Sewer Authority and the Board of Supervisors, and their respective Engineers to address this Township-wide concern. They also need to advertise and formally adopt these changes.
 - (3) There is a July 21st deadline for stormwater grants that they could try to apply for.

- iii) Supervisor Eckman concurred that this was a very large issue that could get out of control if not addressed. She questioned what the penalty would be for a resident, specifically with the infiltration issue, which could be caused by tree roots, etc. Would this be dealt with separately?
 - (1) Mr. Sheridan noted that there are penalty provisions in the existing ordinance. It is difficult to identify where the condition exists, it is not easily done and can be expensive to do. When there are resale inspections that process can be tightened up and an obligation could be placed on the seller with regard to the sewer line.
 - (2) Mr. Dunbar noted that during resale inspections they identify sump pumps. This data is in the GIS system, and can be used to identify illegal connections. The Sewer Authority did a series of smoke and dye tests last year in a particular area of the Township where there were I&I problems. It appears the laterals may be fine but there could be problems with illegal sump pumps. Those areas connected to the Mine Run area of the Township pose the most problems right now.
 - (3) Mr. Sheridan thinks a joint meeting would be good to fully discuss the strategy. They need to identify those homes with problems and then enforce the ordinance.
- iv) Chairman Brown was also in favor of a joint meeting with the Sewer Authority, on a separate evening from the public hearing.
- v) **MOTION** – Supervisor DiPaolo made a motion to plan and advertise the joint meeting with the Sewer Authority. Supervisor Altieri seconded the motion. The motion *passed 5-0*.
- vi) Mr. Brown explained that rainwater that gets into the sewer system is treated at the Oaks plant. Our SA is charged for that treatment. If a sump pump is hooked up to the sewer, it increases the expense of treatment.
- vii) Public Comment:
 - (1) There was no public comment on this item.

10) Comments and Other Business:

- a) Mr. Sheridan has a letter to the Regional Sewer Authority regarding the proposed middle interceptor located between Hoy Park and Cider Mill Bridge. Chairman Brown has been speaking with and corresponding with members of the DEP to relay the nature of the Township's objections regarding this interceptor being sited on the Lower Providence side of the Perkiomen. The DEP requested that the Township formalized these objections, making reference to the regulations within the scope of the objections. Mr. Sheridan is seeking authorization to submit a formal letter on behalf of the Township objecting to the permit application by the Regional Sewer Authority regarding the proposed middle interceptor located between Hoy Park and Cider Mill Bridge.
 - i) **MOTION** – Supervisor Eckman made a motion to authorize Mr. Sheridan to handle this correspondence. Supervisor Thomas seconded the motion. The motion *passed 5-0*.
 - ii) Chairman Brown noted they were in touch with Senator Rafferty and Rep. Vereb. They have agreed to meet with DEP members and Township staff on site to do a walk-thru of this middle interceptor area. This is scheduled for May 7, 2010.
- b) Mr. Dunbar had several announcements:
 - i) He encouraged everyone to get his or her 2010 census forms in.
 - ii) Mr. Dunbar noted Earth Day would be celebrated on April 18th, and there will be a free shredding event here at the Township building that day.
 - iii) The PBR Annual Road Rally bicycle race will begin around 6:30 a.m. and is the opening event for the cycling season.
 - iv) Mr. Dunbar noted that Evansburg Point Park has money set aside to enlarge the parking lot, install a trail system, and install an additional multi-purpose field. The current multi-purpose field meets the needs for all current organizations using that park; therefore it would not be a good use of \$50,000 to modify multi-purpose field. Mr. Lukens recommended this money be used toward installation of the pavilion and tot lot that are on that master plan, expand the parking and install the trails, so they can close out this project.

