

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Board Meeting held May 17, 2016

The business meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 7:35 p.m. by Chairman William L. Hornung, on the above date, in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

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

Also in attendance was George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steve Stine, Township Solicitor; Kay Goodman, HRG; and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Hornung dispensed with the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance as it was previously recited for the Authority meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Ms. Lindsey made a motion to approve the minutes from the April 12, 2016 workshop meeting and the April 19, 2106 business meeting. Mr. Seeds seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

Public Comment

Mr. Robert Cini, 5545 Old Locust Lane questioned why the rescheduling for the meeting for the rezoning was not printed in the paper. Mr. Hornung noted that there was a problem with the original advertising for the meeting. Mr. Wolfe noted that it did not coincide with what was required in the Municipal Planning Code (MPC) and there was no way to advertise a change other than the fact that the new meeting dates were advertised appropriately, that being June 7,

2016. Mr. Cini noted that you should have notified the people who were concerned. Mr. Hornung noted that we put a sign out front of the building.

Ms. Janice Macut, 1509 Pine Hollow Road noted that she had some questions concerning the process that is required by all residents or business owners in Lower Paxton Township to make changes to their property. She noted when you are making changes to your property you should visit the Township to assure that proper procedures are followed before you start. She noted that it is her understanding that a proposed project would require forms to be filled out, an outline of the plan changes, and an estimated cost. She noted that it may require a change in an ordinance, a variance, special exception, conditional use, or even a possible rezoning change. She noted that there is a cost involved, which depending on the size of the project, could get pricey. She noted that there should be public posting of the request change and a hearing date based on the affective surrounding properties. She noted that there should be advertisements in local papers with sufficient notice. She noted that a hearing is scheduled in front of the appropriate committees and there should be public input and time for concerns and questions to be addressed. She noted that decisions by a vote are made by a specific committee and the last and final vote goes to the Board of Supervisors.

Ms. Macut noted as residents or business owners, we are required to follow the policies and procedures of the Township. She questioned why, when a business such as the DJ's Office being built by the IDA, was not required to follow the same process before the work was started.

Ms. Macut noted that we the residents of Lower Paxton Township did not have our due process for the project consisting of the DJ's office, the new and very expansive Babe Ruth baseball field, and the huge addition to the Public Works building. She stated, let's be clear to the public, that this project will require a tax increase to all in the Township with no input from us.

She noted that there has been a considerable amount of backpedaling recently for the mistakes made from the very start of this project and yet no one is being held accountable for their actions. She requested that someone explain to her how it is possible and an acceptable practice by the Board to just go ahead and do what you want, when you want, however you want. She noted that the Board should be setting a higher standard of leadership to be good stewards for all the residents, regarding any project. She noted that you have said on several occasions we can't go backwards and that's true; however, moving forward she noted that if this is the mentality and the actions of the Board and the administration, then we the residents of Lower Paxton Township have to look forward to, then it is time for the residents of Lower Paxton to rethink their choices when the next Board of Supervisors election occurs.

Ms. MaryAnn Haschert, 5908 Pine Hollow Court stated that her home is one of the homes that was damaged by the vibratory roller at the Lower Paxton Township project. She noted that the purpose of her comments tonight is to seek clarification on a few things. She noted that it seems that they have asked these or similar questions before.

Ms. Haschert noted a couple weeks ago, she attended the Planning Commission meeting where the Dauphin County Industrial Development Authority (IDA) presented a lengthy presentation regarding an application they had made regarding the land that they purchased from the Township for the purpose of the MDJ Court. She noted that she was confused about what kind of application it was and when she asked, the Planning Commission members could not answer the question. She noted that Mr. Wolfe did not answer the question and after a minute or two Mr. Diamond, legal counsel for the IDA, answered that it was zoning. She noted that he was not very clear. Ms. Haschert noted that she did not understand the answer, thinking that the application should have been for something like a special exception, a variance, a conditional

use, or one of those other terms. She noted that she submitted a right to know request to Mr. Wolfe and among other things she asked for was a copy of the application. She thanked him for replying promptly. She noted the heading on the application answered her question as it says application for amendment to the zoning ordinance to the Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township. She noted that it is a one-page form suggesting that there were attachments to it that the IDA paid a \$1,000 fee. She noted that it was submitted April 6, 2016. She questioned regarding the bottom portion of the application that is filled out, that there is a line that says, Referred to Planning Commission date. She noted that the date is May 4th. She questioned was the application presented to the Planning Commission on May 4th. Mr. Wolfe noted that off the top of his head he couldn't say. He noted that he is not disputing that. She noted that was the date of the Planning Commission meeting that we attended. She noted that this has been a very difficult process.

Ms. Haschert noted that we have been asking for months about this process and what is required and what has been done and what should have been done etc. and the process has never really been laid out for us and that is why we come to meeting after meeting asking questions, trying to understand what the process is for not necessarily what went wrong, but what is the process. She noted that she has spent quite a bit of time reading as much as she could about it. She noted that she is not a lawyer or municipal planning person, and it is very difficult for her to follow exactly what applies and what doesn't apply. She noted she found that the Lower Paxton Zoning Ordinance seems to be very clear that the MPC applies and it also sounded like that from Mr. Wolfe's remarks earlier about the date. She noted in the MPC it says that the zoning amendments should be presented to the Planning Commission in advance. She noted if there was a meeting on May 4th, it should have been given to them by April 4th but the application is dated

April 6th and it was given to them on May 4th, the same day of the meeting, no wonder they acted so confused when we asked them questions. She noted that they seemed rather lost as to what was going on.

Ms. Haschert noted that the other dates that are on the bottom of the form asks for the publication for where the notice was posted and it states the Paxton Herald with the dates April 27th and May 4th. She noted that the notices were mailed to residents and she did ask in her right to know request for a list of those who were mailed notices, and it was also provided to her, consisting of two to three pages of residents that supposedly received notices that were mailed on April 20th. She noted again her read from the MPC is that it very clearly states that they have to be mailed 30 days prior to the public hearing. She noted that they were mailed on April 20th and the hearing was scheduled for May 17th. She noted that a few minutes ago, Mr. Wolfe stated that the reason for postponing the meeting had to do with timing. She noted that she believes that is what it states in the MPC. She noted that notices were mailed for a June 7th meeting, are you still in compliance with the code. She questioned if the clock would start ticking again with the mailing of the notice on May 11th or 12th whenever they were mailed last week, but you are scheduling a hearing for June 7th which again is less than 30 days. She questioned what applies.

Mr. Hornung requested Mr. Stine to answer this question. Mr. Stine answered that the public hearing requirement differs between the notices that were sent out as the MPC does not require notices to be sent to anyone except when the Township is rezoning someone else's property. He noted in this case the Township is seeking to rezone its property and the IDA is seeking to rezone its property, but we are not rezoning other property; therefore, the 30 day notice that has to be sent out only applies when the Township desires to rezone someone else's property that has not requested a rezoning: otherwise no mailing notices are required. He noted

that the Township sent these notices out as it usually does as a courtesy rather than as a requirement.

Ms. Haschert noted that she wants to be sure that we are referring to the same section as she is looking at Section 609, an enactment of zoning ordinance amendments, B2i, stating, “ in addition, the requirement that the notice be posted, under clause one where the proposed amendment involves a zoning map change, notice of the public hearing shall be mailed by the municipality at least 30 days prior to date of the hearing by first class mail to the addresses to which real estate tax bills are sent for all real property located within the area being rezoned as evidence by tax records with the possession...” Mr. Stine noted that those are the operative words, within the area to be rezoned. Ms. Haschert noted that Mr. Stine is saying that it doesn't apply. Mr. Stine answered that is correct. He noted if we were rezoning a particular area that we didn't own that no one had applied for, every property within an area would have to had a notice mailed 30 days before the public hearing, but we are not rezoning anyone else's property except ours and another property owner who has requested the rezoning.

Ms. Haschert questioned if she wanted to rezone her property which is R-1 to Institutional, her neighbors would not have to be notified. Mr. Stine answered that is correct, not by a letter. It would still have to be advertised and posted but no one would have to be notified by letter. Ms. Haschert questioned why the meeting was postponed tonight. Mr. Stine noted that there was an issue with the date that the Planning Commission received the ordinances and the distance from that date to the public hearing date that was established for the Board of Supervisors meeting. He noted that it has to be at least 30 days apart. Ms. Haschert noted that the May 4th Planning Commission meeting and the Board of Supervisors public hearing has to be 30 days apart. Mr. Stine answered no. He noted that the submission to the Planning Commission for

whatever it is has to be at least 30 days before the Public Hearing by the Board of Supervisors. He noted that there may not have been 30 days between those two dates. Ms. Haschert noted that the application was dated April 6th and the hearing was May 17th, so that is more than 30 days. Mr. Stine noted that is the application, not necessarily the ordinance. He noted that the ordinance would have been developed after the application was filed. Ms. Haschert questioned what date was the ordinances developed. Mr. Stine answered that he did not recall. Mr. Wolfe answered that he did not recall. Ms. Haschert noted that Mr. Wolfe stated that the Township jointly wrote it with the IDA.

Ms. Haschert noted that the ordinance also references that it is supposed to be submitted 30 days to the Dauphin County Planning Commission. She noted in her right to know she did get a copy of the comments from the Dauphin County Planning Commission and the letter is dated May 2, 2016, and it says that they reviewed the request at its May 2nd meeting but it does not say when they received the ordinances. She questioned if anyone knew when it was mailed to the Dauphin County Planning Commission. Mr. Stine answered that he did not know that. She noted for the posted signs, what is the time frame for the requirement for that. Mr. Stine questioned if she meant when they had to be posted. Ms. Haschert answered yes. Mr. Stine answered no less than seven days before the public hearing. Ms. Haschert questioned when the publications for the Paxton Herald must be advertised. Mr. Stine answered not more than 30 days for the first advertisement and not less than seven days for the second advertisement prior to the public hearing.

Ms. Haschert questioned if another notice is going out to the Paxton Herald about the June 7th meeting. Mr. Stine answered that it has probably already been sent. Ms. Haschert

questioned if it has been published yet. Mr. Stine answered that he did not know as he does not get that newspaper.

Ms. Haschert noted in her right to know request she asked for a copy of the zoning permit for the MDJ building and the reply was that no document exists. She noted that she was told that zoning permits are not required until the property owner initiates building construction. She noted when she read the Lower Paxton Township Ordinance and MPC it seems to her that it is very clear that you have to have a zoning permit prior to doing any land preparation, site preparation, excavation, or anything like that. She questioned if that is incorrect. Mr. Stine noted that simply earth moving typically requires an E&S Permit and maybe a stormwater permit, not necessarily a zoning permit. He noted that the zoning permit and the building permit are typically issued together.

Ms. Haschert noted that the ordinance states that the zoning permit is required to be issued prior to the start of any of the following activities: “erection, construction, movement, placement, relocation, or expansion of a structure building or sign, change of the type of use for expansion of the use of structure or area of land, creation of a new use, demolition of a building or partial demolition, site alterations or mineral extractions, excavation or grading in preparation for the construction of a building or a change in use of a property and or construction or installation of any animal waste impoundment, lake, pond, dam, or other water retention plan”. Additionally, in the violation section, it states, “Any person who shall commit or permit any of the following actions violates this ordinance. Failure to secure a zoning permit prior to any of the following: a change in use of land or structure, the erection, construction, alteration or any structure or portion thereof, or the placement of the sign or a change in the area of the use for the land coverage or setback of the use, or the excavation or grading of land to prepare for the

erection, construction, or alteration of any structure or portion thereof.” She noted that her question is, is there a zoning violation right now since that land has been prepared for the building of the District Justice Court, but it still remains zoned R-1 as of this moment. Mr. Stine noted that is a question for the zoning officer as the zoning officer is responsible for the enforcement of the zoning ordinance. He noted that the zoning officer is the only one who can interpret the zoning ordinance in order to determine whether or not there is a violation. He noted that no one here can answer that question.

Ms. Haschert questioned when is the next opportunity that she would have to ask the zoning officer that question. Mr. Stine answered that you would have to contact the zoning officer. Ms. Haschert questioned if she could contact the zoning officer at the Township building. Mr. Stine answered yes. Ms. Haschert questioned if they work regular hours. Mr. Stine answered as far as he knows. Ms. Haschert questioned if that is Amanda. Mr. Stine answered yes. Ms. Haschert questioned what her last name is. Mr. Stine answered that it is Zerbe.

Mr. Terry Riley, 5700 Locust Lane noted that his first question if it is possible to have these meeting videos put on the web site so that we can see the meetings after the meeting is over. He suggested that a lot of places do that. Ms. Lindsey answered that it is not on the web site but you can watch it Thursday night at 6 p.m. and Saturday at noon on the TV channel. Mr. Riley questioned if it could be posted on the web site and be downloaded. Ms. Lindsey noted that we have never done that before.

Mr. Riley questioned how we got to this point. He noted that Locust Lane is basically a quiet dead end road in the middle of nothing except for houses. He noted out of all this Township when you look this way it is nothing but businesses, highways, commercial properties; whatever did you guys think to put a District Justice Office back here on this quiet road. He noted that he

will never understand that. He noted that even though his kids are the only ones who walk on the road, he doesn't understand. He noted that he can't fathom out of all the places to put this DOJ, there was no other place to put it. He noted that it is disconcerting that these are the kinds of decisions we are making in our Township especially this one, so simple. He noted that he had to say this because he is a resident and he has kids and if he doesn't voice his opinion on the subject then he hasn't done his job. He noted that there still is time for you guys to say, you know what, this would be better on Union Deposit Road or Derry Street, anywhere in a commercial district. He noted that even close to here, there is stuff that is right down the road, instead of bringing everyone through our quiet street. He thanked the Board.

Mr. Tim Murphy, 1524 Pine Hollow Road noted that he lives adjacent to area three that is proposed for rezoning. He wanted to follow up on one thing, based on Mr. Stine's comments. He was wondering if the County IDA was given a written notice of the proposed zoning change on their land. Mr. Stine answered they applied for the rezoning change so we are not required to give them an additional notice. He noted it is only when someone, a land owner is having their property rezoned and they don't know it's happening, for instance if they didn't apply for it and that is when you need the notice. He noted that the IDA actually applied for the rezoning.

Mr. Murphy noted that he wanted to speak to the Township's website. He stated that he appreciated what Mr. Riley said but it is pie in the sky as compared to what we have to deal with. He noted that he went on the Township's website yesterday to get the agenda for today's meeting and what popped up. He noted first he went to get the meeting schedule and what popped up was the meeting schedule for 2008, don't ask me why; it's worked in the past, so he gave up on that. He noted that he went back on this morning he was able to get the meeting schedule and when he clicked for tonight's agenda he got the April 19th meeting agenda. He noted that he went on

again this afternoon, same thing. He noted at 4 o'clock this afternoon he still could not access tonight's meeting agenda. He noted that any dreams of having videos on the website are just totally out of the question at this point. He questioned if we are meeting the sunshine requirements. He noted if he can't access tonight's meeting agenda three and a half hours before the meeting is that really meeting the requirements for Sunshine.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if there was an issue with the website this afternoon. Mr. Wolfe answered not that he is aware of, no. He noted that he just got it on his phone. Mr. Murphy noted at 4 o'clock this afternoon it was not available. He noted that this is symptomatic of the way things are on the surface: you say you're open and transparent and a listening board but it makes it difficult for the township residents to participate when we don't know what's going on. He noted that this meeting was originally going to be a public hearing, it wasn't. He stated that he went on the website to find out what is going to be on the agenda and he found last month's agenda. He noted that is not acceptable.

Mr. Murphy noted that he has mentioned this before as you are going through your agenda when Mr. Wolfe is covering various items he is constantly referring to your packet of information. He noted that those of us who are sitting in the audience don't have a packet of information, we don't know what these items are. He noted that we have no idea what the content of the various resolutions are, what the agreements are that you are voting on, it is a line item agenda and that is all we know. He noted that he has asked before and he will ask again, can there be more disclosure to the public in what is in the packets, even if it is just a reference copy on the agenda table, something that we can look at before the meeting starts to have some clue of what it is we are sitting here listening about. He noted that a resolution number does not mean anything to us, we need to know the content.

Mr. Hornung noted that you probably won't get access to the packet at this point in time because they are not public documents until they have been enacted. He noted that they are not open to the public as they may have mistakes in them or things that are not approved yet. He noted that the answered at this time is no.

Mr. Murphy questioned if there could be at least be a one or two sentence description of what the topic is. Mr. Hornung stated that we may be able to expand on it. Mr. Murphy noted that he would appreciate it.

Mr. Eric Epstein, Chairman of SWAN, 4100 Hillside Road noted that he wants to keep the Board updated on SWAN's position and he will hand the Board the testimony that he has for tonight's meeting. He noted that he has a question about real estate taxes and that the Board had a reverse course in the way it handled real estate taxes regarding negating penalties charges. He noted that the constituents were asking him if that is effective as of today. He questioned if a new protocol been installed based on the fact that you had reversed the course. He questioned Mr. Stine when the effective date was. Mr. Stine questioned Mr. Epstein if he was speaking for people who are asking for relief. Mr. Epstein explained that we had four homeowners who for not fault of their own did not receive timely real estate tax notices and the Board agreed that if they paid the taxes they would be forgiven from penalties. He noted that is a reverse course based upon the law. He questioned if that is effective now. Mr. Stine noted that the law has always been in effect as it is nothing new in regard to real estate law. Mr. Epstein noted that the Supervisors were not following the law in regard to that prior to waiving the fee. Mr. Stine suggested that the law states no matter if you receive a bill or not, the tax is still due and it is the obligation of the taxpayer if they don't get a bill to seek it out. Mr. Epstein noted that was not his question, for the four homeowners, was the Board following the letter of the law or not. Mr.

Stine noted that the law does not say that the Township could not grant a waiver. Mr. Epstein questioned why we passed a resolution saying you will follow the letter of the law and not vote to forgive the penalties. He noted that he is confused. Ms. Lindsey noted that we did not pass a resolution last week, what we did was we talked about what is posted in the tax office and that we need to be more attentive to what the law says. She noted that she brought it up for discussion at the workshop, so it was not a resolution. Mr. Epstein questioned if it is policy. Ms. Lindsey noted that we were just discussing it. Mr. Epstein noted that the confusion is that you could still waive the penalty even though the law says you can't waive the penalty. He questioned if there are instances where the Board would waive the penalty. He questioned if there is a policy that we will not waive the penalty especially if there is a law that says you can't waive the penalty and you did it four times.

Mr. Hornung noted that according to what Mr. Stine is saying the law doesn't say we can't waive the penalty, only saying that the penalty is to be enforced. Mr. Stine noted that is correct. Mr. Hornung noted that the Board has the ability to waive the fee and if you are asking if we have a policy, we don't have one as to what we will do in these situations.

Mr. Epstein suggested that the law is clear cut that if you can't... he noted that he is confused and he does not want to waste more time on it, but he thought there was a new policy that you talked about that you will not penalize people if they got a late real estate bill due to no fault of their own. Mr. Hornung noted that is not true. He noted that we will probably not be giving relief in that area in the future. Mr. Epstein noted that he has known that the Supervisors in the past have waived fees for things like the purchase of Colonial Country Club. He noted when it comes to a resident who did not receive a tax notice, it would make sense if we wouldn't

penalized them through no fault of their own. Mr. Hornung noted at this point we are taking them case by case.

Mr. Epstein wanted to invite the Board to a meeting on June 6th at the Epiphany Lutheran Church, noting that SWAN opposed the testimony provided by the McNaughton Group for the Parkway Farms housing. He noted that Joel McNaughton contacted SWAN to speak directly to the residents so he wanted to invite the Board to the meeting. He noted that the proposal was rejected by the Planning Commission at a previous meeting.

Mr. Epstein noted that the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission received a grant for \$235,000 for Route 39. He noted that it is beginning now in concert with HRG. He noted that the Board has discussed priorities, and he hopes that the Board will integrate the results of this study with the priorities. He noted that one of the priorities banded around the development along Linglestown Road. He noted that we have invested a lot of time for this study and traffic counts have just begun, but before you crystalize your priorities into the future, he asked that you take into consideration the most recent study for Linglestown Road. He noted that one has not been done in ten years. He explained that he will make the same plea to the Planning Commission as they have asked for a \$50,000 grant to help them with planning. He noted that the study goes from Front Street to Route 22, and if you look at Lower Paxton's zoning we have up to seven or eight different zoning designations in the Township for Linglestown Road. He noted from four to six in the evening it is a parking lot and is starting to look like Route 22.

Mr. Epstein noted that he is asking the Board to consider the retail proposal for Colonial Road by Vanguard Reality to consider a traffic study. He noted for anyone who has to negotiate Sheetz on Linglestown Road, it is daring already. He noted that PennDOT told him that he did not need a traffic study but he would like the Board to look at this again.

Mr. Hornung questioned if we can have this in writing. Mr. Epstein noted that he has it written down and will provide it to the Board after he is done.

Mr. Epstein noted on the topic of public notification, he questioned Mr. Stine if when you talk about things is there a difference between business days and calendar days. He noted in the future we need to be more specific. He noted that he has lost cases based on that definition. He noted that he was coming to tonight's meeting for the public hearing and heard a rumor that it was postponed. He noted that he called some residents and ask them if they got a notification that the hearing was cancelled. He noted that there is a message in a bottle protocol, but as of Sunday the lawn stakes in the grass around the project had not been changed. He noted that 48 hours prior to the hearing it was still announcing a hearing for Tuesday. He noted that changes have not been changed on the agenda as he printed it out, even up to today, the changes on the agenda have not been made. He suggested that the Central Dauphin School District usually posts the agenda the Friday before and you can get access to information. He noted that you can get access to personnel information so he would ask whoever the IT person is to go to the Vo Tech website or the CD website Friday's before meetings; not only the agenda is posted but detailed information is posted. He noted that it is doable. He noted that the new notification is better than the old one where you had a piece of paper around a telephone pole which no one read. He noted that the stakes 18" by 24" with an 8.5 by 11 sheet stapled to it, this is not express mail. He noted that it is not real time notification and we can do better. He wanted to make a plea to the Township to improve your notification, public outreach protocol, and technology. He suggested that we need to notify residents and interested parties of cancellations, change of venues and delays in the meetings in a proactive and timely manner. He noted that SWAN has been to almost every meeting that the Township has convened since 2007, absent the Shade Tree

Commission and Friendship Center, having a 95% attendance rate. He noted that he can't tell you how many meetings we have attended where there was no notification or cancellation until his members got here. He noted that is wrong. He noted that we need to do better and he would not do that to the Board. He noted that the technology exists to post changes on any website and to update agendas more than 24 to 48 hours ahead of time, and you could be posting local weather channels in our area and traffic construction, delays and warnings about criminal activities and threats. He noted that we do that all the time at Central Dauphin and we have 92,000 constituents, 11,200 students, and 1,000 employees. He noted that some municipalities use the flashing road signs to let you know about traffic or weather.

Mr. Epstein noted if we operated in the same fashion at Central Dauphin, can you imagine if we delayed or postponed school and announced the changes via a yard sign in Dauphin, Enhaut, or Fishing Creek. He noted that people would be pissed. He noted if the only public record for a school delay for when a bus doesn't show up was a sign on the window at the Transportation Department or if a weather delay was limited to an announcement by a town crier at the Linglestown Square, it would not be acceptable. He noted that we have to move forward as the technology is there and it's not that expensive. He noted that we do real time tape and archive the tape for a month, very inexpensive, and we are the only school district on the East Shore that does it, but it is something we can do. He noted that SWAN doesn't have the ability to notify the residents as it is not his responsibility, but when the residents find the Township has an error or short come on its website, we need more tech support and better IT and more outreach, at the very least we can expand the use of text alerts for constructive dedicated application. He noted that it is not hard or expensive, as people would have to sign up for a text alert and it would go out to them. He noted that we do that day in and day out at Central

Dauphin, noting if there is an incident at the school, the parent's gets a text. He noted that the Township is a little behind and if the Township is going to cancel, change venues, delay, or postpone meetings, it is only fair that you notify constituents in a timely fashion. He noted that you are very good in getting out here in a timely fashion; why not notify folks in a timely fashion of these changes. He noted that his phone number is 635-8615 and you can call him at any time and he would be happy to meet with Mr. Hornung to discuss these ideas.

Mr. Hornung noted that we will review our policy on notifications and you are welcome to attend the meeting noting that you always have a representative at our meetings. He asked Mr. Wolfe to put this on the next workshop agenda. Mr. Epstein noted that he copied his attempts to get the material over the weekend and he time stamped everything. He noted that SWAN is a solution based group and we are trying to look for a way to improve communication and dialogue. He noted that he will have a member of SWAN at the workshop session. Mr. Hornung noted that he appreciates Mr. Epstein's comments as he is trying to make the Board look better in what it does. He noted that we will look to see what we can do to improve the system. Mr. Epstein noted that 55 minutes into the meeting and you are still taking public input, that is great.

Mr. Don Haschert, 5908 Pine Hollow Court noted that the Township created a Committee to celebrate Linglestown's upcoming anniversary but the Board could do something similar to that with the IT. He noted that they should bring some of the residents in and have a committee to get together and improve the technology. He noted that he goes to the website and he can't find anything. He noted that it does not need to be the Township only, involve the people. Mr. Hornung noted that these are things we can discuss at the workshop on the second Tuesday in June.

Mr. Forest Healy, 5917 Shope Place noted, at a previous meeting months ago, he brought up the fact that a baseball field was removed but there was a bigger and nicer field put in its place. He noted that Mr. Hawk has stated that we did not lose a field as we gained a field on Colonial Road. He noted that it doesn't help his kids and some of the other kids. He noted that there are a lot more families moving into Shope Place and Locust Lane in our area. He noted that although it may help the Township as a whole it doesn't help where it was removed from. Ms. Lindsey noted that the fields are at Mateer Field, not on Colonial Road, in the Colonial Park area off of Locust Lane.

Mr. Healy noted that it is not across the street from where a lot of kids are. Ms. Lindsey noted that it is in the vicinity. Mr. Healy noted in a much busier vicinity, not as good for kids but that is his opinion. He noted that there is a document regarding the ballfields in that it says that a Babe Ruth Field was relocated and a midget field was removed and the bigger, newer Babe Ruth Field was put in the place of those two. He noted that it says that those who reserve the field will be able to use it. He noted at the Planning Commission meeting that happened two weeks ago, Jim Diamond said that the judges actions go on during the course of the day and it would not coincide with the goings on for the baseball field that would normally occur on the weekends. He noted in the past, his kids and others have used the field but did not reserve the field, they just walked across the street and used it. He questioned if they will still be able to do that with the new ballfield. Mr. Hornung suggested that they would be. Mr. Healy noted that he did not get that from the document as it sounded like only those who reserved it would be able to use it. Mr. Hornung noted that the reservation policy is for instance, if PHR or Paxtonia are having a baseball game they have to have the ability to reserve the field for that game so they have some type of guarantee that when they show up they have a baseball field to play on. He

noted that it does not mean that the other hours of the day that it is available that the kids couldn't play on it. He noted that they normally don't reserve an entire day for the field but they also reserve the fields for practices. He noted, it is a way to keep it organized and we do that as we have thousands of requests for fields every year. He noted that we try to accommodate the baseball organizations. He noted that the fields outside of the reservation times are available for open play. Mr. Healy noted that he did not see that in the document.

Township Manager's Report

Mr. Wolfe noted the Linglestown Memorial Day Parade will take place on Memorial Day at 1 p.m. Mr. Seeds noted that the Memorial Day Fun Run will be held at the Linglestown Life United Methodist Church meeting at 11 a.m. He noted that the one mile walk/run will start at 12:15 p.m. with a fee of \$10 for adults. He noted that veterans and children under 12 are free. He explained that the proceeds from the walk/run will benefit the Heroes Grove project.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Three Mile Island will conduct a siren test on Thursday June 2nd at 12:15 p.m. He noted that it can be heard in the Township and the test is done annually.

Board Members Comments

Ms. Lindsey noted that this is EMS Week and she wanted to thank South Central EMS for the service that they give to the residents. She wanted to thank the residents and those who attended that Heroes Grove celebration on May 7th. She noted that we sponsored the Rally the Troops event with R.J. Harris with roughly 300 people in attendance.

OLD BUSINESS

Action on an agreement with HRG, Inc in regard to financial services to investigate funding alternatives for the Colonial Road corridor

Mr. Wolfe noted that Kay Goodman from HRG is present to answer any questions you may have regarding the proposal to investigate funding alternatives for the Colonial Road

corridor. He noted, during a recent meeting, the Board requested HRG to provide a proposal in regard to funding and funding alternatives for the Colonial Road corridor. He noted that proposal was submitted for consideration for the Board's consideration this evening and Ms. Goodman is present to answer your questions.

Ms. Lindsey questioned will HRG be applying for the grants for the Township as well. Ms. Goodman answered, through this proposal, it would just be finding those options for the Township and if you would want HRG to apply for the grants on the Township's behalf, HRG can prepare another proposal as well. Ms. Lindsey suggested that she thought that this would include that HRG would be applying for the grants as well. Ms. Goodman noted that it would only cover the strategy to look at the different programs and deadlines and what the priorities are with the different programs.

Ms. Lindsey noted that you are proposing \$2,000 just to do that and not to apply for any grants. Ms. Goodman answered that is correct as it is for time and materials. She noted that it is only estimated at that cost.

Mr. Hawk questioned if the areas that you are going to research are in addition to the ones you already have access to. Ms. Goodman answered yes. She stated the traffic study that was completed for the corridor did suggest some programs for the Township. She noted as HRG is researching those we may also come across others that will also benefit the program.

Mr. Hawk noted that you probably have access to most financing capabilities and he questioned if these would be new ones that would bring in a level of special interest to the project. Ms. Goodman answered that we do have experience with some of these programs.

Mr. Hornung noted that what we are trying to get at is that we were somewhat taken back with the dollar amount in that we felt that a fair amount of this information you already had and

had done in previous studies and we are not happy with \$2,000. He suggested that it should be done for less, especially with having worked for the Township in this area in the past and considering the amount of work we do with HRG, the Board was surprised. Ms. Goodman noted that we are only going to bill for time and materials that are used so if it doesn't reach \$2,000 then you won't be billed for \$2,000 as it is only an estimated cost.

Mr. Hawk noted that he felt that HRG had most of this information at its fingertips already. Ms. Goodman answered some we do and some of it keeps changing as well, so we need to see what the priorities are with some of these programs as sometimes from year to year the projects they are funding have changed their priorities and we want to make sure that we have all the latest information for you.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if HRG could apply for the grants for the Township. Ms. Goodman answered yes but it would be in another proposal.

Mr. Seeds questioned what we are going to get for \$2,000. He noted that you are already our consulting engineer, and we do a lot of business with HRG, so he is not sure what we are getting as he is confused by this proposal. He noted that he would like to see something else come out of this, something more concrete.

Mr. Hornung noted that Mr. Seeds would like HRG to provide for the completion of the application for financing resources. Ms. Lindsey noted that knowing that we do have some of this at their fingertips, it seems like the \$2,000 is too much; even if there is a little bit HRG has to research as Ms. Goodman stated that they already have some of this information.

Mr. Hornung agreed and stated that we spend this money for HRG to provide a list for when the grants have to be applied for, and then we have to come back to the next step, and you will provide another proposal. He noted that we would rather have a proposal for the end result

so that we have something that is concrete and will provide some type of financial assistance for us. Ms. Goodman noted that the Board is looking for a proposal for how much it would be to apply for the grants. She noted that we were trying to take all those programs out there with the results of the corridor improvement plan and make sure we are marrying up all the proper grants or opportunities that are out there as we need to be careful as sometimes one grant won't allow you to use another type of grant as its match. She noted that we are trying to come up with a strategy for you. Mr. Hornung questioned if that is part of the \$2,000. Ms. Goodman answered the strategy yes, coming up with how we can get those funded for you.

Mr. Hornung noted that he would like Ms. Goodman to go back and provide a scope of work that involve making the applications. He noted that you can break the strategy and the application work into two pieces if you want and he would like to see who would be working on the project. He realized that it can change but he wants to know what class of employee would be working on the program and their rate schedule. He noted that you plan to bill on a time and material manner based on the rate schedule so he noted that would be helpful for the Board to understand. He noted that he would like to see a not-to-exceed price noting that he is not looking for an open checkbook.

Ms. Goodman noted that the Board would like to see both the strategy and then what the costs would be to apply for each of the grants. She noted that you are looking for who will be working on that particularly and who will be preparing the applications. Mr. Hornung noted what classification and the corresponding rate is. He noted that you may not be able to quote who will be working on the project, and if that is not possible, the classification will suffice. Ms. Goodman noted that you are also looking for a not to exceed amount, separating the two into two

different line items within the proposal. Ms. Lindsey suggested that the proposal should be on the low side seeing the amount of work that the Township provides to HRG in a year's time.

Mr. Hornung noted if we move forward, HRG typically does the engineering so it is an opportunity for you to provide yourself more work.

Mr. Eric Epstein noted that he is confused as in his former life he was a consultant to East Hanover Township working on the Route 743 Corridor and the Walnut Street Corridor. He questioned if we are advancing this to Transportation Improvement Projects (TIP) and Harrisburg Area Transportation System (HATS) to see if they are interested in funding it. He noted that all of this does not mean anything unless we are at the table pushing like Carlisle does and saying we have a corridor here and we want to see what the appetite is for HATS to help fund it. He noted in all the transportation projects that he has worked on, his first stop was at HATS. He noted that you need to get it on the TIP and make it a priority. He noted that we will need legislative support as it is serious heavy lifting. He noted that is where he would put his money.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Township has done that in the past. Mr. Seeds noted that your point is well taken.

Mr. Hornung questioned if we need to do anything at this time. Mr. Stine answered that no action is necessary at this time.

Appointment of individuals to serve on the Township's 250th Anniversary Committee

Mr. Hornung put out the following names to be appointed to the 250 Anniversary Committee: Polly Murphy as the chairperson, John Hanks Jr., Chris Lunden, Denise Deimler, Donny Gross, Kathie Gifford, Ed Hine, Jay Purdy, Sherrie Davis and Connie Herman.

Mr. Seeds made a motion to approve those individuals to be on the Township's 250th Anniversary Committee. Mr. Hawk seconded the motion. Mr. Hornung called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Resolution 16-23; supporting legislative efforts to reform legislative redistricting and congressional reapportionment

Mr. Hornung noted that this resolution involves trying to come up with a compact area of representation. Mr. Seeds noted that it will try to do away with gerrymandering.

Mr. Hawk noted that there are some legislative districts such as District 11 which is an extremely large area that runs from North of Hazelton to end of the Cumberland County line including Luzerne, Cambria and Dauphin Counties. He noted that the attempt is to try to get a more homogeneous representation. Mr. Hornung noted that it would be something that would make more sense for those communities.

Mr. Seeds noted that last night at the Capital Region Council of Governments (CAPCOG) meeting, over 40 representatives were present from three or four counties. He noted, in the past, there was opposition to this, but making the change will help this get better as it has worked in other states. He noted that they are trying to take the politics out of the redistricting. He noted that Mechanicsburg was split in half with their legislative districts and it is really difficult for them to know who their representatives are. He noted that locally, Congressman Lou Barletta is our Representative but he lives in Hazelton, 110 miles from Harrisburg and some of the districts don't make sense. He noted that the vote to change this was 35 to 2 to approve the change to move forward and these resolutions will be sent to the House and Senate.

Mr. Hawk noted that Representative Dent lives in Allentown that covers part of Dauphin County. He noted that we need to take it out of politics to make it better.

Mr. Hornung noted that the alternative is to have an independent party work on this. Mr. Hawk noted that it won't be an easy task. Mr. Seeds noted that they mentioned that they want to take three or four members of each major party and some independents who will look at this as the redistricting is done after the ten year census are completed.

Mr. Lindsey made a motion to approve Resolution 16-23 calling on the Commonwealth legislators to reform legislative redistricting and congressional reapportionment. Mr. Seeds seconded the motion. Mr. Hornung called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Mr. Eric Epstein noted that he was one of the persons involved in having Superior Court Senior Judge Stephen McEwen removed from the redistricting process because he thinks it is extremely partisan. He noted that he supports the resolution but the answer is simple you can do it by computer. He noted that it will still be political but it won't be as political. He noted that a young woman from eastern Pennsylvania filed an appeal noting it is a computer away taking out all the partisan efforts. He noted that there are 253 districts but the majority are 65/35 or 60/40, noting the House Speaker Perzel's district looks like Dracula's fang. He noted at most we have 30 competitive districts in the House and Senate. He noted that this is a step in the right direction but the person who upheld redistricting the last time was a young lady who figured it out by doing it on a computer, taking the politics out, providing for competition in the political marketplace.

Resolution 16-24; requesting that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
Install protective devices in grassy medians on divided highways

Mr. Hornung noted that we are requesting that guide wire be installed in grass median on divided highway to prevent people from crossing over and resulting in head on collisions and loss of life.

Mr. Wolfe noted that this is also a resolution recommended by the CAP COG.

Mr. Seeds noted that this comes out of Cumberland County from a bad accident that occurred along I-81 where an out of state woman was killed in a crossover accident. He noted that they want the Commonwealth to install cables in the median to save some lives.

Mr. Seeds made a motion to approve Resolution 16-24 requesting that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania install protective devices in grassy medians on divided highway. Mr. Hawk seconded the motion. Mr. Hornung called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Action on an agreement with All City Management Services, Inc.
for the 2016-2017 school crossing guard services

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board discussed this proposed agreement during its recent workshop session, noting that the Board was generally in favor of the agreement but wasn't sure that it wanted to enter into this agreement without the ability to exit the agreement should services be determined to be provided in an inefficient or unsatisfactory manner. He noted as a result, paragraph 12 was added to the agreement on page two that states, "Either party, Township or contractor, shall have the right to cancel this agreement by giving 30 days written notice to the other." He suggested that the agreement is ready for action this evening.

Ms. Lindsey noted that ACMS did not sign the agreement. Mr. Wolfe noted that it was emailed to PSD Spotts today. Ms. Lindsey questioned if it has been signed. Mr. Wolfe answered that he does not know if it has been signed, but they are agreeable to sign it. Ms. Lindsey noted that the Board normally likes to have the agreements signed before it will sign it. Mr. Seeds noted that he doesn't have a problem with that.

Mr. Seeds suggested that the 30 day notice was in the last agreement. Mr. Wolfe noted that PSD Spotts indicated to him that they added that part of the agreement.

Mr. Seeds noted that we would be guaranteed 1,620 hours at a minimum of \$20.97 per hour. He noted that they would have to work to be paid that amount. He noted if they failed to show they would not be guaranteed that amount of hours. He questioned if we have four or five guards. Mr. Wolfe answered four. Mr. Seeds questioned if they work three to four hours a day. Mr. Wolfe agreed. He noted 16 hours at 180 school days, what does that work out to. He noted that this only guarantees 1,620 hours. He noted that there is no penalty for if they don't cover a post that an officer has to fill that post, taking him away from some other duty to fill in. He noted that Mr. Crissman had an issue with that. Mr. Hawk noted that we would not be billed if the crossing guard did not show up and the police officer did the assignment. He noted that Mr. Crissman was interested in accessing some form of a penalty to the company. He questioned if that has been resolved. Mr. Seeds noted that is not part of the agreement. Mr. Wolfe answered that All City has not agreed to a penalty suggested that the best thing to do is to bring this back to the next workshop meeting.

Ms. Lindsey noted that she would like to see a signed agreement and although they state that they will send an alternate it bothers her if they will do that. She noted that she would like to have a representative from the company to come to the meeting to answer their questions. Mr. Seeds agreed.

Mr. Hornung noted last week we told PSD Spotts and Mr. Crissman noted that he would accept it if there would be a failure to perform penalty clause which would allow the Township to get out of the contract. He noted that he sought a penalty but he did not feel that we would have much chance of getting it, but he wanted a performance clause. He noted that you could require an agreement that if we had to go bid it to someone else because they did not perform, left with no one to provide the service, that we would have wiggle room there. He noted that we

have to give PSD Spotts something to go on as we can't get them to sign something if we haven't decided what we are looking for. He questioned if there is some way we can come to a resolve or should we wait until Mr. Crissman is at a meeting to hammer out a formal contract for ACMS to sign.

Mr. Seeds noted that we have time to work this through.

Mr. Hawk noted that Central Dauphin School District is using their services. Ms. Lindsey questioned what other school districts in the state are using it and PSD Spotts did not know. She noted that the only person using it is Swatara Township.

Mr. Hawk noted that Ms. Lindsey's initial concern was that it was a California Company but then they assured us that they have local representatives, but he does not know where they are located. He suggested that one is located in Lancaster and it would be that person's responsibility to get a replacement. He noted if none were available we would have to use our police officers. He noted that Mr. Crissman wanted a penalty if we had to do that. Mr. Hornung noted that Mr. Crissman accepted it as long as there was a failure to perform clause that would allow the Township to get out of the contract.

Mr. Hornung requested Mr. Wolfe to put this back on the workshop agenda. Ms. Lindsey noted that she would like to have the local representative come to that meeting to find out how many other school districts in the State are using their services.

Ms. Janice Macut questioned what would be the vetting process for criminal background checks. She questioned if this company would provide for that. Mr. Seeds answered that it is spelled out in their proposal that they would follow the same state laws that we have to follow. Ms. Macut questioned if the Township would have that information on file. She noted that anyone who is represented by this company would have to have a criminal background check.

Ms. Lindsey noted definitely. Ms. Macut explained that she wanted to be sure since you are talking about a company from a different State. Mr. Seeds noted that it is in the contract.

NEW BUSINESS

Action on a Master Equipment Lease with Ford Motor Credit Company LLC for three 2016 Interceptor Sedans and one 2016 Interceptor Utility

Mr. Wolfe noted that this is the same structure of leasing that the Township has entered into with Ford Motor Credit Company LLC for the last several years. He noted that the total lease payments over a three year period for four vehicles is \$108,944.71. He noted that they will be purchased through the Commonwealth's Costar's Plan and the lease is through Ford Motor Credit. He noted at the end of the lease the Township owns the vehicles with no additional payment.

Mr. Hornung questioned if they would be replacing vehicles. Mr. Wolfe answered yes as it is the same number we purchase every year. Mr. Hornung questioned if we sell the old ones. Mr. Wolfe answered eventually.

Mr. Hawk made a motion to approve the Master Equipment Lease with Ford Motor Credit Company LLC for three 2016 Interceptor Sedans and one 2016 Interceptor Utility vehicle. Ms. Lindsey seconded the motion. Mr. Hornung called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Action on bids for the 2016 Road Paving Program

Mr. Wolfe noted that bids were open for the 2016 Road Paving Program and the lowest responsible bidder was Pennsy Supply in the amount of \$791,774.60 for both the base bid at \$628,830.62 and two alternates, one for Hillside Road at \$86,856.09 and the Fairfield Street at \$76,918.51. He noted that the engineer recommends and staff concurs that the bid be awarded to

Pennsy Supply with the base bid and the alternate for Fairfield Street only bringing the total bid amount to \$704,918.51.

Ms. Lindsey questioned why the other street was not included. Mr. Wolfe answered that we are out of money. He noted that we stretched it a little bit but we do have some road maintenance funds that are available.

Mr. Hornung requested Mr. Wolfe to cover what streets are to be paved for this project. Mr. Wolfe answered that he did not have his list. Mr. Hornung noted that it is Galion Street, Marblehead Street, South Arlington Avenue, Fritchey Street and Fairfield Street as the alternate.

Mr. Hornung questioned when the work would be done. Mr. Wolfe answered that typically it would be done in the summer months.

Mr. Seeds noted that it is mostly paid by Liquid Fuels Funds.

Mr. Seeds made a motion to approve the bid to Pennsy Supply in the amount of \$704,918.51 with the alternate of Fairfield Street for the 2016 Road Paving Project subject to the following conditions; complete bid review by the Township Solicitor, receipt of required insurance documents, and receipt of acceptable Performance and Payment bonds. Mr. Hawk seconded the motion.

Mr. Seeds noted that the engineer's estimate was \$773,550.50 and we are below the engineers estimate.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Township only received two bids for this project. Mr. Wolfe noted that we normally don't get that many bids for roadway paving unlike the sanitary sewer projects. He noted that typically we only get two to three bids for the roadway paving.

Mr. Hornung called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Change Order #4 to the contract with York Excavating
for site work at the Public Works facility

Ms. Lindsey read from a statement recusing herself from this agenda item.

Mr. Wolfe noted Change Order #4 extends the date for final completion and provides for an extension of the outfield fence along the common property line between the Township and property owned by the Hare Family. He noted that the height of the fence will increase from 8 feet to 14 feet and the change order price is \$9,541.72.

Mr. Tim Murphy 1524 Pine Hollow Road noted that he did not know what this change order would consist of and he was pleasantly surprised. He noted that it is not something he was expecting initially but it is something the neighbors can live with. He questioned if this is the last part of the contract and if there is anything else left to be done on this contract other than the fence. Mr. Stine noted that the landscape buffer needs to be done. Mr. Murphy questioned if they will be doing that as well. Mr. Stine answered that they won't be doing it but there will be a landscape contract. Mr. Murphy noted that he was asking specifically about York Excavating. He questioned if they have any role in the Public Works garage construction. Mr. Wolfe answered no. Mr. Murphy noted that it sounds like they are winding down. He questioned what will be the next expected completion date. Mr. Seeds noted that it is November 4, 2016. Mr. Wolfe noted that would be substantial completion with final completion December 4, 2016.

Mr. Hornung questioned when the fence will be installed. Mr. Wolfe answered that they will install the fence as soon as the sod is in a condition that it can support rubber tire equipment, in roughly four plus weeks. Mr. Hornung noted that it will help when we get dryer ground as he would like to have it put up before the games are played. Mr. Wolfe answered that it would be installed before any games are played.

Mr. Murphy questioned what the schedule for the use of the field is. Mr. Wolfe answered that there is none at this point.

Mr. Seeds made a motion to approve Change Order #4 to the contract with York Excavating for site work at the Public Works facility in the additional amount of \$9,541.72 to bring the total contract to \$1,142,924.85. Mr. Hawk seconded the motion. Mr. Hornung called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Resolution 16-05; accepting the dedication of park land in Stray Winds Farm

Mr. Wolfe noted that this resolution would accept the dedication of park land in the Stray Winds Farm Development. He noted that the release of liens for park construction and the maintenance bond for 18 months is also included in the packet. He noted that the item is complete for your consideration this evening.

Ms. Lindsey noted that she had a concern for when she was on Road Tour about the grass and the soil as it does not look the best as it is very rocky so she is not too sure that the grass will grow in that area. Mr. Seeds noted that he had the same concern. Mr. Hornung agreed. Mr. Seeds suggested that we go back and talk to the developer noting that it is not a surface he would want his children to play on. He noted, in other parks we have had the same situation, but some of the athletic organizations have spent their funds to resurface the parks to put good sod in so the children can play on a safe surface. He noted that we need to go back to the developer to see if he can do something better. He suggested that we table this resolution at this time.

Mr. Hornung questioned what staff should be directed to take back to the developer to do in order that the Board would accept the park. Mr. Seeds noted that he would like to see better sod, about two or three inches of surface that would not be a rock surface. Mr. Hornung noted that they planted grass but they need more topsoil.

Ms. Lindsey noted that they need more topsoil and reseeding.

Mr. Hornung noted that we discussed that the placement of the light posts seem to be odd and one was leaning. Mr. Wolfe noted that the light was not leaning, rather the light foundation was not complete but structurally it is okay. Mr. Seeds noted that he would not want us to have to spend tax dollars on this; he noted that the quality is not there.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Board would like to see the developer put several inches of topsoil down and reseed the land. Mr. Seeds noted that we could get a recommendation from someone who is more knowledgeable than us. He noted that we have many engineers working for us. He noted that the Board will not be voting on this resolution.

Declaration of Lot Consolidation for 4601 Goose Valley Road

Mr. Wolfe explained that this address is comprised of two parcels that are identified on the Lower Paxton Township tax map as 35-027-004 and 35-027-005. He noted that the property owner is a single ownership who desires to consolidate the two parcels into one lot. He noted that the property owner has provided the Township with a Declaration of Consolidation of previously subdivided lots and it is ready for the Board's action to approve this evening.

Mr. Seeds noted that it is very simple and straightforward.

Mr. Hornung questioned why the owner wants to do this. Mr. Wolfe answered that he did not know.

Mr. Hawk made a motion to approve the Declaration of Lot Consolidation for 4601 Goose Valley Road. Ms. Lindsey seconded the motion. Mr. Hornung called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Improvement Guarantees

Mr. Hornung noted that there were no improvement guarantees.

Resolution 16-25; authorizing the acceptance of an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation for electronic access to PennDOT's systems

Mr. Wolfe noted that he had a resolution that is required to be acted upon by the Board of Supervisors, authorizing the acceptance of an Intermunicipal Agreement with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation providing for the Township to access the Department's electronic records system. He noted that this system provides for engineering and construction management. He noted that Lower Paxton Township is in the process of moving forward with the design of Red Top Road Bridge which is on the Transportation Improvement Program and for the Township to move forward we must become approved to communicate with the Department on its electronic system. He noted that this resolution will authorize the Chairman to sign the Intermunicipal Agreement consisting of two pages and a signature page.

Mr. Hornung noted that we need access to PennDOT's system and in order to get it the Board must approve a resolution.

Ms. Lindsey made a motion to approve Resolution 16-25 authorizing the acceptance of an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation for electronic access to PennDOT's systems. Mr. Seeds seconded the motion. Mr. Hornung called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Payment of Bills

Mr. Seeds made a motion to pay the bills of Lower Paxton Township, Lower Paxton Township Sewer Authority, and payroll checks. Mr. Hawk seconded the motion. Mr. Hornung called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

Announcement

Mr. Hornung noted that prior to or following this meeting the Board will meet to receive information from the Township Manager.

Adjournment

There being no further business, Ms. Lindsey made a motion to adjourn the meeting, and the meeting adjourned at 9:26 p. m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

William B. Hawk
Township Secretary