

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop Meeting held October 11, 2016

A workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6:03 p.m. by Vice Chairman Gary A. Crissman, on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

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

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

Mr. Crissman noted that Mr. Hornung was ill this evening and that he would chair the meeting.

**Pledge of Allegiance**

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

**Public Comment**

Mr. Don Haschert, 5908 Pine Hollow Court noted that he lives very close to the new Public Works building. He noted that there is an agreement with the abutting property owners to have the side of the building that faces us to not have any windows on it. He noted when he looks at the building the top five feet of the building is going to be windows. He noted that he would like to understand more about that from the Supervisors.

Mr. Crissman noted that there are windows, 16 or 17 feet high around the top for light to go into that facility. Mr. Wolfe noted that they are not windows, they are translucent panels, they don't open, you can't see through them. Mr. Crissman suggested that the Board saw the panels last week. Mr. Wolfe noted that the purpose is to allow light to enter the building.

Mr. Haschert noted that light gets out. He questioned if light will not be able to get out. Mr. Crissman noted if the lights are on, it is opaque, it is not translucent or transparent. He noted that there will be muted light.

Mr. Haschert questioned if the Township is abiding by the agreement that it signed with the adjoining neighbors. Mr. Crissman answered to the best of his knowledge, yes. Mr. Haschert

questioned if opaque windows letting light in and out is a violation of that agreement. Mr. Crissman questioned what Mr. Haschert's point is. Mr. Haschert answered that his point is that the windows face right into his backyard and it will light up his backyard. Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Haschert is saying that we are not supposed to have windows in the building. Mr. Haschert answered that is what the agreement says that you are not supposed to have windows on the side facing the property owners. He questioned if it was news to Mr. Crissman. Mr. Crissman answered yes. He noted that he is surprised that he is hearing that as he thinks the Board has been following all the things set forth in the plan for what has been approved. Mr. Haschert noted that the windows are on the property side. Mr. Crissman noted that he hears what Mr. Haschert is saying. He noted that it will have to be reviewed in order to provide a response. Mr. Haschert noted that it is in the agreement, noting that he is not a party to the agreement but he was knowledgeable of the agreement. Mr. Crissman noted that you are bringing this to our attention and you are saying that we are in violation of the agreement. Mr. Haschert answered that he did not participate in the agreement but there was a specific clause that we would not be able to see the building or inside the building and in the summer time it is not too bad, but the leaves are starting to fall, the lights are on, and now his backyard is lit up.

Mr. Crissman noted that he does not recall any specific direction as to no windows. He noted that is the point in question that needs to be reviewed. Mr. Haschert noted that it is an interpretation, getting down to a Lower Paxton Township Board of Supervisors interpretation of a window. He noted that the expectation was, his expectation was, that it would be solid panel wall and light would not get out. Mr. Crissman noted that would not be his as we have had discussion and had the product brought in and everyone has had an opportunity to see it, therefore he assumed that it was to be included.

Mr. Haschert questioned when that happened. Mr. Crissman answered last week. He noted that we saw the product last week as one of the residents was asking if it was transparent or translucent. He noted that they brought the product in to look at. Mr. Haschert questioned if you determined when you looked at it that light could get out of the window. Mr. Crissman answered yes, there would be light but it is translucent to the same extent if it was transparent or clear.

Mr. Tim Murphy, 1524 Pine Hollow Road, he noted that he was at the meeting last week when Virginia Alexandra raised the question. He noted that the offer was made upon her request that she would get to see those panels, now whether that has happened or not he did not know. Mr. Crissman stated that he thought she did last week when we had the sample here. Mr. Wolfe answered that we had the samples here two weeks ago. He noted that Mr. Kline, if he hasn't, is in the process of scheduling a meeting to show the panels to the property owner.

Mr. Murphy noted that his bigger point is if the panels are being put in to allow light into the building unless they are reflective, light has to come out also. He noted that is the point the neighbors are making, call it a window, call it whatever you want, if light is coming out it has the same effect as a window. He noted that Ms. Alexandra explained last week that it is a continuous line of open windows at this time, with light pouring out. He noted that it is not acceptable and the people under that agreement have a legitimate complaint about that.

Mr. Crissman noted that he would only disagree with your comment with regard to the amount of light. He noted if it is clear the amount of the light that would transverse over that area would certainly be different than if it was opaque or translucent. He suggested that an engineer would tell us that.

Mr. Murphy noted that he is an engineer but not a lighting engineer and he will not pretend to be one, but if you put the panels in there to allow light in and they transmit light that is the problem. He noted that the light is going to be shining in the neighborhood.

Ms. Lindsey noted that we discussed last week that the working hours for the facility is 6:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m. She noted that the only time that those lights will be on is if we have snow and they were in there working on the trucks as they leave at 2:30 in the afternoon. Mr. Murphy noted that he understands that.

Mr. Don Haschert noted that Ms. Alexandra could not be at the meeting but she said the product was not brought in last week. Mr. Wolfe explained that he just stated that. Mr. Crissman noted that he was corrected as it was two weeks ago. Ms. Haschert noted that it is in the agreement, no windows.

## Review of MS4 budget items for 2017

Mr. Erin Letavic from HRG noted that she wanted to get some information to the Board as they prepare their 2017 budget. She noted that the Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4), will need to apply for a new permit in 2018. She noted that there will be a need to prepare for it in 2017 and it needs to be budgeted. She explained that information needs to be sent to the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) by September of 2017 and she put together a scope that identifies some of those requirements.

Ms. Letavic explained that the Township currently operates under a General MS4 Permit, the same that everyone else operates within the State. She noted that the newest interpretation by DEP is when you have a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) stream, an impaired stream within your Township boundary, Paxton Creek, you are now required to apply for an Individual Permit instead of a General Permit. She noted that they are not significantly different with the exception of the submittal fees. She explained, in the past, a General Permit application fee was \$500 but an Individual Permit fee is \$5,000. She noted, due to the time frame for budgeting for 2017, she wanted to let the Board know that the fees have not been released by DEP yet so she can't inform the Board what the application fee will be. She suggested that it could be a couple thousand dollars more than what the Township has paid in the past.

Ms. Letavic noted that DEP has commented that Individual Permit applications will not be significantly different from the General Permit application which is currently available so the assumptions in the scope is that the only thing that will change will be the submittal fee.

Ms. Letavic noted since there will be changes she thought it would be good to discuss the new permit changes, what it means to the residents, and the Board as elected officials. She noted that the Individual Permit form will need to be submitted and since it is similar to the current one that level of effort should not be very significant. She noted that the Chesapeake Bay Pollutant Reduction Plan (CBPRP) is the item that appears to be the most expensive to the Township in terms of this submittal. She noted that it will be very similar to the Paxton Creek TMDL that you are doing along with Capital Region Water (CRW) and Susquehanna Township (ST). She noted that you have to do this part on your own unless you intentionally decide to develop a CBPRP

with other municipalities. She noted if you are interested in that she can answer questions for that.

Ms. Letavic explained that Lower Paxton includes the Paxton Creek Watershed for about 50% of your area with the rest being non-Paxton Creek. She noted that we did a modeling for the entire Paxton Creek for the three municipalities but this pollutant reduction plan will look at a different area. She noted that the good news is that for all of those projects within the Township boundary we had done the last time they will be modeled for the sake of the CBPRP requirements and it will create what we will call the base line to identify whether or not, if you do all your work in Paxton Creek, if it is enough. She noted if it is not we may have to identify projects elsewhere.

Ms. Letavic noted that the Township is ahead of the game as you have gone through this process before but the project area has changed and we are looking at the entire Township boundary, not just the Paxton Creek Watershed.

Ms. Letavic noted that HRG will put together a preliminary cost estimate and a preliminary implementation schedule. She noted that DEP wants to see that the CBPRP requirements will be accomplished within a five year period. She noted that the permits run on a five year cycle, starting in March of 2018, and the Township will have from March 2018 through to March of 2023 to build some projects. She noted that the Paxton Creek TMDL has a much more fluid schedule so we will see how these two will marry together in order that you can meet your obligations with one project for both programs.

Mr. Wolfe questioned if the work that Ms. Letavic will do in accordance with this proposal for the Paxton Creek TMDL, will those activities be in addition to that depending on how we handle the Paxton Creek TMDL. Ms. Letavic answered yes. She noted that her hope is when we model it, we have enough projects in the Township already that you are covered, but in the instance that you are not, we would have already identified what we need to do. Ms. Letavic noted that the trick is what it takes to get the CBPRP requirements met, those projects will need to be constructed in a five-year period. She noted when it comes to the schedule we will be thinking about DEP permits, flood plain issues, and things that take time to get ready for approval, otherwise you would have a lot of construction in a one or two year period and she was not sure that it would manage the program practically.

Mr. Crissman questioned if you can share the milestone that exists for August 1, 2017 through September 15, 2017. He questioned if all of this can be accomplished in that amount of time. Ms. Letavic answered that this is just the planning phase.

Mr. Crissman requested Ms. Letavic to provide a time frame for what needs to be done and what the results will be. Ms. Letavic answered, for the short time frame, we will working on mapping and modeling in the wintertime; and for the spring, work on the plan to schedule cost estimates to make sure that they are projects that the Township wants to focus on. She noted that they must be feasible and have the property owner's consent. She explained that many of the projects will occur on private property so there will be a lot of educational outreach necessary to make it a success. She noted in the summertime, the August 1, 2017 milestone will be the time frame in which we need to be prepared the have the final draft ready for public comment. She explained that there is a 30-day required public comment window with August 1 being the last day we can issue that to meet the 30 days to receive comments and still have 15 days to respond to those comments, to make the revisions to the plan in order to submit the plan by September 15, 2017. She noted beyond that, once we identify the projects, she is not sure how long it will take to get DEP approval, but March 2018 will be day one of the five year limitation plan. She noted that it makes sense to get started on some designs, and work with property owners that want to help as it will be an ongoing effort for many years to come.

Ms. Letavic noted that there is an allowance within the budget to include some hours for technical assistance. She noted that you have a MS4 coordinator on staff and it is a good idea to have a specific budget so everyone has a good level of expectation in terms of how much HRG should be involved, and how much time they will be spending with staff. She noted that she set it up on a time and materials basis because the modeling is a little bit of an unknown noting that we will know when we are done when we are done. She noted in the instance that we have some results that you want to review and do another reiteration, we will build time in the schedule for that so that staff knows that it is a plan that can be implemented.

Mr. Wolfe noted that it is important to understand that the work that is being performed here does not cover the whole picture of our stormwater management program. He noted that there is capital spending for facility upgrades, a need to work cooperatively with CRW and ST

on the Paxton Creek TMDL to get a reduction of sediment in Paxton Creek by 35%. He noted that this is just one part of the overall process that we need to address in the coming year.

Mr. Crissman questioned how the interface with CRW and ST is playing out. He questioned if they are discussing this very same thing, and how we can come together to facilitate this. Ms. Letavic answered in terms of agencies, she has attended a two-day training session with DEP specifically about the permit and another day on pollutant reduction planning. She noted that DEP is taking this very seriously and they are expecting to see good work to be submitted to them as they are short staffed and expect municipalities to do the right thing to submit good work. She noted that the EPA continues to look at these programs very closely.

Ms. Letavic noted that the Dauphin County Conservation District is aware of these requirements as HRG works closely with them on these things to the extent that we can find some cost sharing, we will petition pretty hard for that. She noted, in the coming year, there will be more and more mapping exercises as DEP wants more and it may be a county-level initiative and not a municipality level initiative. She noted that we discussed these issues with many municipalities in Dauphin County to the extent that we see commonality we will bring it to your attention, similar to the success that you have had so far with CRW and ST.

Mr. Wolfe noted that HRG was one of the consultants that worked with LP, CRW and ST in preparation for the Paxton Creek TMDL Plan. He noted that they are well aware of the efforts of the neighboring municipalities.

Mr. Crissman noted that it is a commitment of \$30,000 to take this first step. He questioned if the other municipalities are also involved in the first step as well. Ms. Letavic answered that they are getting the same message this month.

Mr. Wolfe requested Ms. Letavic to provide a brief update on the Creek Drive plan. Ms. Letavic noted that upon execution of the agreement they scheduled surveys to go back out in the field to verify some of the work done previously and capture data in places that we had not previously surveyed. She noted that the scope of this is a little different than the previous hydraulic studies that we have done. She noted that we have done very basic preliminary analysis to date.

Mr. Crissman noted if there is a consensus from the Board we will need to place this on the agenda for next week. He question if there will be any updates to bring to the Board between now and next week. Ms. Letavic answered no, but she will keep the Board aware of any updates.

Request from Grove Homes, Inc. to release the improvement guarantee for Kings Points

Mr. Wolfe noted that this has been pulled from the agenda at the request of the applicant.

Discussion regarding the political sign regulations in the Township's Zoning Ordinance

Mr. Stine noted that Mr. Wolfe requested him to look at the zoning ordinance in regards to signs, and political signs. He noted that there may also be a few others that need to be reviewed. He explained that many are definition related, noting that it is in relationship to a case that was settled by the United States Supreme Court in 2015, Reed versus the Town of Gilbert. He noted that the Supreme Court undertook a different way of looking at sign ordinances with regards to regulation and made some determinations for what is content versus the form of the sign. He noted that he has to review the ordinance to see if any of the things that the Supreme Court did in that case will affect the current status of our sign ordinance or if we need to make any amendments to it. He noted that he will review it with staff to see if we need to make amendments, and if we do, we will propose to bring them back to the Board.

Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Stine if he will be reviewing all the definitions and regulations for the signs. Mr. Stine answered yes, the definitions for sure, and also you will notice the sheets before you that there are highlights for the different size for the signs. He noted that will be a particular area of inquiry as well.

Mr. Crissman noted that nothing will occur until after this set of elections that will be applicable for implementation. Mr. Stine answered that is correct.

Mr. Stine explained that he found out that there are no restrictions on political signs for when they can be put up. He noted that they are referred to as the temporal requirements, noting if it is on public property you can restrict it; however, if it is on private property you cannot restrict a political sign. He noted if someone wants to put a sign up year round, they can do it.

Mr. Seeds questioned what about right-of-way. Mr. Stine answered that it is public property. Mr. Seeds noted that there can be no restriction for time period before the election. Mr.

Stine answered that is correct. He noted that our ordinance states that they have up to two weeks after the election to take the signs down.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Mr. Stine will review all of that. Mr. Stine answered yes.

Ms. Lindsey noted that this time of the year there are always many complaints because of the larger signs. Mr. Seeds noted that there would be no restrictions for private property for the larger signs. Mr. Stine answered no. Mr. Seeds noted that they can have as large as they want on private property. Mr. Stine noted that we will look into that. He noted that the Supreme Court mentioned that size limitations are acceptable in certain situations so he will have to look at that to see if it will be one of the things that needs to be change or amended. He noted for private property if they want to put a political sign or a religious sign, those signs don't need permits typically and they can stay there year round.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if they can be as big as a billboard. Mr. Stine answered probably not. He noted that a billboard is a particular type of sign.

Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Stine had an anticipated date to return with his findings. Mr. Stine answered that he has not scheduled a meeting yet with staff, but once he does that and reviews the ordinance he will have a better idea.

#### Review of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Quarter Indicator Report

Mr. Wolfe noted that he has reduced the report to a power point for the Board and viewing audience. He noted that the third quarter for the year for the first nine months of the year are basically what we use to prepare the estimate of year-end standing for each individual line item as we go through the remainder of 2016. He noted that we use those numbers to determine what the fund balance will be at the end of year and to project forward into 2017 for its budget. He noted that it is the most important report of the year.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the 2016 General Fund was balanced at \$22,695,974 with the following budget categories: Liquid Fuels Fund - \$1,403,880; General Improvement Fund - \$9,253,926 in expenditures; Fire Equipment Capital Fund - \$304,350 in revenues and \$2,200,000 in expenditures; LOSAP - \$80,520 in revenues and \$30,000 in expenditures; Friendship Operating Fund -\$2,234,174 in revenues and \$2,216,265 in expenditures; LPTA Operating Fund - \$15,309,951 in revenues and \$15,052,514 in expenditures; LPTA Capital Fund - \$9,319,000 in

expenditures with a total 2016 Spending Plan of \$62 million, not including pension funds. He noted that the FC and LPTA are enterprise funds and as such are not required to be balanced.

Mr. Wolfe noted that prior to 2008, the Township addressed increasing demands for municipal services due to the growth in revenues and expenditures; however from 2008 to 2010 the “great recession” caused reductions in municipal services in response to diminished revenues. He noted in 2011 to 2014 there have been moderate rebound in revenues, but not to pre-recession levels, and there has been a continuation of a conservative approach to municipal spending.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the beginning balance for the following funds are as follows: General Fund - \$8,058,326; General Improvement Fund - \$4,665,679; Fire Equipment Capital Fund - \$1,183,033; LOSAP Fund - \$487,935; Friendship Center Capital Fund - \$28,066; Friendship Center Operating Fund - (\$199,514); LPTA Fund - \$35,096,612; and Pension Fund - \$35,329,651.

Mr. Wolfe noted at the beginning of 2016, the General Fund balance was \$8,058,326, and by policy, 25% of the \$22,695,974 budgeted for expenditures which is \$5,673,994 must be held as a rainy day fund. He noted on 9/30/16, the fund balance was \$9,764,836. He noted that the most significant source of tax revenue have been received at this time, and in the final quarter of the year, the Township receives very little tax revenue for operations.

Mr. Wolfe noted as of 9/30/16 the municipal debt is as follows: in 2012, the Township issued \$2,000,000 in new debt for municipal capital projects; in 2012, the Township received a PA Infrastructure Bank (PIB) loan in the amount of \$750,000 for road maintenance and improvement projects; in 2013, the Township issued \$4,000,000 in new debt for capital projects; in 2014, the Township issued \$7,000,000 in new debt for capital projects; and in 2016, the Township issued \$4,000,000 in new debt for improvements to stormwater facilities and systems.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the General Improvement Fund expenditures over the past 7 years are as follows: 2015 - \$4,288,541; 2014 - \$1,901,190; 2013 - \$1,619,479; 2012 - \$2,078,509; 2011- \$1,071,041; 2010 - \$1,070,034; and 2009 - \$1,273,680; with a 7-Year Total of \$13,302,471.

Mr. Wolfe noted that that 2016 General Fund budget is balanced with revenues and expenditures at \$22,695,974. He noted that the third quarter General Fund revenues were

\$16,732,484 and expenses were \$15,025,974, producing a net gain of \$1,706,510. He noted that General Fund revenues were 1.8% higher in the third quarter of 2016 as compared to 2015, primarily due to the real estate tax increase. He noted that the General Fund expenses were 7.7% higher in the third quarter of 2016 as compared to 2015; however, the overall General Fund budget for expenditures in 2016 is 12% higher than the previous year. He noted that this included an increase in the real estate tax for 2016.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the State Aid Fund (Liquid Fuels) is a sub-component of the General Fund providing for maintenance and construction of local roads. He noted that it was budgeted with \$1,403,880 in revenues and expenditures. He noted that the beginning balance in January 1, 2016 was \$150,165; the Township received revenues of \$1,446,596, having expenditures of \$1,219,247, leaving a third quarter balance of \$377,515. He noted that typically this fund is zeroed out at the end of the year, and all funds are used for roadway improvements or equipment to improve the roadways.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Fire Equipment Capital Plan covers nine primary apparatus for three fire companies. He noted that the beginning balance on January 1, 2016 was \$1,389,033. He noted that there were revenues of \$305,051 with expenditures of \$2,343,960. He explained, as of September 30<sup>th</sup>, there was a deficit of \$649,876. He noted that the deficit is currently unwritten by the General Fund and will be paid off by annual allocations to the Fire Equipment Capital Fund in future years. He noted in 2016, the Board of Supervisors authorized and executed the contract for the purchase of a piece of firefighting apparatus for all three of the fire companies, Linglestown, Colonial Park and Paxtonia. He noted \$2.4 million is the estimated expenditures in 2016 is all for the firefighting equipment.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Length of Service Award Program provides a defined benefit stipend to qualifying volunteer firefighters and/or fire police officers who provide extended service to our community. He noted that most beneficiaries have at least 20 years of service by the time they reach age 65 at which time benefits can be paid. He noted that 11 members currently receive a monthly benefit. He explained that the beginning balance on January 1, 2016 was \$487,935. He noted that the fund generated revenues of \$91,284 with expenditures of \$18,905 leaving a current fund balance of \$560,314. He noted that the maximum benefit that a firefighter or fire police officer can receive is \$250 per month at age 65.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the General Improvement Fund is for one-time capital projects and is budgeted with expenditures of \$9,253,926. He noted in January 1, 2016, the beginning balance was \$4,665,679; having revenues of \$4,667,679 and expenditures of \$2,159,811 providing a net of \$2,508,036. He noted that most of the revenues were from the 2016 bond issue that allocated \$4 million to this fund. He noted that you will see a significant draw down in the third quarter for these projects. He noted that it will be impacted by the Township's inability to do the Winfield Street/Houcks Road project due to an ongoing dispute with the contractor who was selected to do the work He noted the \$2.2 million project is in limbo and a drawn upon this fund will probably not occur in 2016.

Mr. Wolfe explained that the balance as of September 30<sup>th</sup> is \$7,173,715. He noted that the Capital Projects are as follows: Public Works addition - \$4 million; Stormwater Management - \$1.7 million; Bridge Replacements - \$1.9 million; Friendship Center Priority Project - \$470,000; and Park Improvements - \$600,000

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Friendship Center is an "enterprise" entity; revenues from user charges fund expenditures. He noted that the 2016 Operating Fund expects \$2,234,174 in revenues and \$2,216,265 in expenditures. He noted that the third quarter revenues were \$1,783,669 with expenditures of \$1,668,443 providing a gain of \$115,226. He noted that it is a gain of 23% greater than this time last year. He noted that the Operating Fund is expected to annually generate \$170,000 for the Capital Reserve Fund, but the Friendship Center is not meeting this contribution for capital reserves. He explained that in the second quarter, the Township transferred \$292,374 from the General Fund; composed of a \$100,000 annual contribution, \$25,000 for Senior Center expenses, and \$171,743 to smooth debt.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the annual membership chart shows continued growth and now approaches 5,000 total memberships. He noted that the annual memberships is stagnate, but in 2009 Healthcare memberships became a very popular way for individuals to obtain access to a health and fitness facility. He noted that family memberships on an annual basis are a thing of the past, and many are members of Silver Sneakers, or Healthways and go to the Friendship Center on an individual pass and it shows up in the pink line as opposed to the blue line.

Mr. Wolfe noted that concludes the third quarter Key Indicator Report for this evening. He explained that it is absent the pension funds and the Sewer Authority as the Authority report

will be presented at the meeting to be held on November 22nd. He noted that the pension funds will be discussed at the end of 2016.

Mr. Crissman noted for the fire equipment purchases, do we have an update for the process. Mr. Wolfe answered that all three units were purchased off a Pennsylvania Costars contract that municipalities can piggyback on. He noted that all three units are on schedule with a few change orders possible, but each chief has been informed that all change orders must be brought to the Board for its approval. He suggested that two units will be received in 2017 and one may be the end of 2017 or the beginning of 2018.

Mr. Crissman noted that the borrowing the Board did and the debt service that accompanies it allows the Board to achieve level debt service having the least impact on the citizens providing the same payments and not having bumps to pay it off.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the trending in the third quarter is the most important quarter as we begin to do our budget preparation. He noted that the trends for the third quarter are consistent with past years. He stated that he did not see any major bump outs that are skewing what we are reviewing for the final numbers for 2016. Mr. Wolfe answered, at this point, we will be ending 2016 in the black, by how much he don't know yet. He noted as shown in the preliminary budgets for 2017 we are slightly in the black as well. He noted that staff will not be proposing an increase in the real estate tax for 2017, and it looks like 2016 will be very similar to 2015 and 2017 will be very similar to 2016.

Mr. Crissman noted that there are no items scheduled for the "Otta Know" session and there are no improvement guarantees as well.

Mr. Crissman noted that he and Mr. Hawk sit on the Audit Committee and that Committee met with the Auditors to discuss the rates for 2016, 2017 and 2018. He noted that next week we will be prepared to make a recommendation for those fees and he thinks that the Board will be very pleased. He noted that what we have paid in 2015 is extremely favorable as we look forward to 2016, 2017 with a slight increase for 2018. He noted that further information will be shared with the Board next week.

### Announcements

Mr. Crissman noted that prior to and following this meeting the Board met to receive information from the Township Manager.

Mr. Seeds noted in recognition of National Breast Cancer Awareness Month, the Capital Fountain water was dyed pink and the Village of Linglestown has adorned its Christmas pine tree with pink and white lights in the roundabout. He noted that the Linglestown Area Civic Association along with a generous donor are responsible for this. He suggested that it is worth a drive to the Square to see how beautiful the tree is.

Mr. Crissman noted that tonight, at sundown, starts the observance of Yom Kippur. He wanted to acknowledge this event for our Jewish Community.

Mr. Crissman noted that the next Board meeting will be held on Tuesday, October 18, 2016 at 7:30 p.m.

### Adjournment

With there being no other business, Mr. Seed made a motion to adjourn the meeting, and the meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle  
Recording Secretary

Approved by:

William B. Hawk  
Township Secretary