

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop Meeting held June 9, 2015

A workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 6:07 p.m. by Chairman William B. Hawk, on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

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

Also in attendance was George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steven Stine, Township Solicitor; District Attorney Edward Marsico; Matt Bloom, CRIMEWATCH; Lt. Gary Seefeldt, Lower Paxton Township Police Department; Public Safety Director David Johnson; Ed Ward and Eric Sentz, Penn Waste; Jeff Staub, Dauphin Engineering; Richard Yingst and John Zervanos, Shadebrook; Esten Rusten and Bob Stanley, GHD; Andrew Kenworthy, HRG; and Watson Fisher, SWAN

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Public Comment

No public comment was provided.

Presentation by CRIMEWATCH Mobile and District Attorney
Edward Marsico regarding the Township Police Department website

District Attorney (DA) Edward Marsico introduced Matt Bloom from CRIMEWATCH and Lt. Gary Seefeldt from the Lower Paxton Township Police Department. He noted that he wanted to provide a background on what CRIMEWATCH is and what he has been doing. He noted that many times he has become frustrated with the media for how to disseminate information the good things that we are doing.

DA Marsico explained that he has worked with Mr. Bloom in the past with other crime projects and presented him with the idea to form a partnership for a County website. He noted that the county project was taking much longer than he hoped so he developed a public-private partnership with CRIMEWATCH who developed the website.

DA Marsico explained that Mr. Wolfe is displaying the Township Police Department's website on CRIMEWATCH. He noted that each police department has their own separate site and it all feeds to the Dauphin County portal. He noted if you go on the County site you will see things from the various police departments and it also has Twitter and Facebook and continues to show different information. He noted that some information is static such as the medication drop off boxes and their locations, and also the accreditation information regarding Lower Paxton Police, but it also has a news feed for different events that have occurred in the Township. He noted what he really likes about this is that the website is interactive, he noted that the entries generate to Facebook and Twitter and there are places where people can submit tips. He explained that he has been very successful in getting tips from individuals to help solve crimes or locate wanted individuals. He noted that the tip feature is an important aspect of the program.

DA Marsico noted that the website has been in operation on the County level for over two years and Penbrook, Hummelstown and Steelton have done a great job in getting the information out to the website. He noted if you live in Penbrook, you are not getting much news coverage for what is going on with the media; however, for the citizens of Penbrook CRIMEWATCH is the greatest tool to be offered to them. He noted that notices could be put up for road closures or no parking situations and residents can sign up to get email notifications every time the Lower Paxton Townships posts new information.

DA Marsico noted for the DA County website, when he posts something, the news media picks it up and publishes it without him having to filter numerous phone calls. He noted that he had a press conference last week and he posted the schedule for it and he did not have to make phone calls to the media alerting them of the event. He noted with Lower Paxton Township coming online and hopefully the City of Harrisburg in the near future it will be a great tool for getting out the news.

Mr. Bloom explained the way the web is changing, and with law enforcement having to engage people, much happens electronically. He noted that bigger companies, like Google, who manage the search for the internet have made it nearly impossible for your website to be found if it is not mobile friendly. He noted if the website is not updated, it will be harder to find them. He noted that the Police website is mobile responsive, so any device that you have, such as a smart phone or tablet, it will resize and format to make it easy for the person to read. He noted that it is

moving the Police Department away from the informational website where people go once or twice a year to get a phone number to being the location to go to for the news that is happening in their local community, and part of it is crime related news. He noted that it is a powerful tool for the Township to be able to provide accurate information to the citizens and local media, and any information that you need to get out to the public, you have a direct channel to do this. He noted that police departments have a lot of technology today that they can employ such as buying crime mapping solutions or tipping services or notification tools. He noted that CRIMEWATCH is an all-inclusive web form so it puts everything into one package. He noted that there is a lot of public pressure for police departments and district attorneys' offices to start utilizing social media using twitter and Facebook to be more transparent in the community. He noted the challenge is when you have a police department that is not trained and doesn't understand how to use social media, it is very dangerous for them to step out into those realms and accidentally post something that they regret posting. He noted now, if they post something to Facebook, that information is shared 1,000 different times and becomes a permanent marker, and there is no way to retract or edit the information. He noted that DA Marsico wanted a way to control information across social media; therefore with CRIMEWATCH, the police departments use what is called control shared technology, so when they post something, and it goes out to social media, that information is hosted back on the CRIMEWATCH site, and if they realize that the information needs to be taken down or update it, they can do that on the CRIMEWATCH system and it will automatically go out and update or delete the information after it has been shared. He noted that it helps to limit the liability of the use of these platforms from the police perspective, and it also allows a police department to know how many hits they had on the information.

DA Marsico noted that there has been a huge problem with synthetic drugs lately and he has certain information on the DA's site, County site, and local departments for parents to provide them the information that they need to know. He noted that the mapping feature is very informative. He noted in Penbrook, you can see in a small community where the incidents are occurring on a given street. He noted that you can look at the larger picture or a street-level picture and when you click on the icon, it will tell you what type of event occurred. He noted that the mapping feature is outstanding.

DA Marsico noted for the County CRIMEWATCH website, they have received many tips that have been very helpful to the police. He noted that there is an app for it. He noted that the County site has information from various police departments and he noted that many reporters are using the County site.

DA Marsico wanted to thank Public Safety Director David Johnson and Lt. Gary Seefeldt who have always been good with the press. He explained if something happens on a weekend, he can enter the information on the website and all the reporters get the information and he does not have to take all those phone calls.

Mr. Bloom noted if you go on any of the sites, you will see on the menus that you can sign up for alerts and you will receive email notifications getting one email each day.

PSD Johnson noted that it is a great tool and something we have tried to get on for years. He noted that Lt. Seefeldt has done an outstanding job in getting the information posted day.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if there is one specific person in the Police Department who handles the web site. PSD Johnson answered that it is Lt. Gary Seefeldt.

Mr. Bloom noted as the program expands, there will be the capability of adding more people, providing levels of protection to ensure that the wrong information does not get out until it is approved. He noted that command staff would need to approve all information before it is posted.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if there is a link on the Township website to this. Mr. Wolfe answered that the website currently does not have the link as he was waiting for this presentation, but the website for the Police Department will direct users to the CRIMEWATCH website.

DA Marsico noted that Dauphin County Crime Stoppers has partnered with Pennsylvania Crime Stoppers and they are part of the CRIMEWATCH system as well. He noted that it is all integrated to provide tip information. Mr. Bloom noted that the tips come directly to the Police Departments so his company does not intercede with that information, but he has the capability that if they have information on a case that they are working, and the individual might be in Albany New York, when they make those posts, they can tag Albany New York and the information will populate in those markets. He noted, if someone is seen in New York, the tip

will come back to Lower Paxton Township. He noted that it is a great way to share and collect information in a way that was not possible before.

DA Marsico suggested that more people would be willing to do a tip on a smart phone than to make a phone call. He noted that young people don't talk on the phone, they text each other. He noted that he will provide a big push later this summer when the new mobile app is developed and upgraded.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the service is available now to the public. DA Marsico answered yes. Mr. Crissman questioned how quickly it can be done. Mr. Bloom answered that the Township site is up and running. He noted if you go to lowerpaxtonpd.org, you will be able to access the site. He noted when it is unpublished it is hard to get access, but in preparation for this meeting, he put it up for all to view. He noted for Dauphin County it is dauphinCRIMEWATCH.org and DA Marsico's site is dauphinda.org. DA Marsico noted if you get to the county site, you can access all the individual sites.

Mr. Crissman questioned if everyone County-wide is upgrading. DA Marsico answered not at this time. Mr. Crissman questioned how the information is getting out to the general public. DA Marsico answered that he has flyers to hand out to each community, especially at events like National Night Out. He noted that his biggest frustration is educating the community about this tool. He noted that we have good materials but have not found the good model to get the information out to the general public.

Mr. Bloom noted that CRIMEWATCH has an ongoing relationship with the police that are doing this so we can get feedback if things are not working right, but also help to get the message out there to connect. He noted that we have the materials and when someone is ready to go live, they get posters, flyers, and postcards. He noted that he encourages people to take the posters to public locations such as library and other public buildings. He noted that it doesn't say CRIMEWATCH on it, rather it promotes the Lower Paxton Police Department.

Ms. Lindsey noted that it could be put in the next Township Newsletter. She asked what the cost for this program was. DA Marsico answered that it was developed from monies that his office gets from Penn National Casino. He noted, several years ago, when Senator Piccola was still in office, he set up that a small portion of the gaming grant funds would come to the District Attorneys' Office to combat crime. He noted he invested in the CRIMEWATCH program and

the records management system, In SYNC, for a county-wide police records system, with the exception of the City of Harrisburg, so that he can sit at his desk and review the police reports. He noted that he funneled some of the funds to the City of Harrisburg for surveillance cameras. Ms. Lindsey thanked DA Marsico for sharing the funds.

DA Marsico noted that each community and police department can post what they feel is important to them.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if there is a cost to the Township. Mr. Bloom explained that DA Marsico supplemented the Township's first year subscription that was due this year as it was only \$1,800. He noted as you go into the next renewal period, we will review the costs from a count perspective. He noted that the pricing model works out to be \$.15 per citizen per year. DA Marsico noted that Lancaster County has joined the program, and Montgomery County and Cumberland County will probably follow as well.

Review of a fire apparatus replacement report

Public Safety Director (PSD) David Johnson noted that he provided the Board members his memo detailing his fire apparatus replacement study. Mr. Hawk noted that certain engines need to be replaced and one may need to be kept in service as a backup unit. PSD Johnson explained that it would have to be decided where to house that unit, noting that he referenced that towards the end of the report. He noted that the other issues will be who pays for the insurance and maintenance of the engine. He noted that a couple of years ago, there was a reserve engine and there were issues surrounding it.

PSD Johnson noted that the Dauphin County comprehensive study of fire services was completed the end of 2011. He noted in that study they identified redundant apparatus throughout Dauphin County which included Lower Paxton Township, and they found that each fire company had a redundant engine or ladder truck. He noted that the study indicated that all three of the fire companies should maintain their ladder trucks as they have compelling arguments for why they should have a ladder truck as they are all-volunteer fire companies and there is no guarantee that they can get drivers for the different apparatus. He noted that it is expensive to train someone to drive a ladder truck, and years ago, an inexperienced driver took the tiller truck into the City of Harrisburg, lost control and hit numerous cars. He noted that

Colonial Park has most of the high rise buildings, Paxtonia has the hotel on Mountain Road and Linglestown has significant set-backs where they can't get the fire apparatus up the driveways and need the ladder truck. He noted that there is a lot of strong opinion for what each one feels that they need and whatever the Board chooses to do, there will be some hurt feelings.

PSD Johnson explained that he met with the fire chiefs and he recommends that each fire company should get two pieces, Colonial Park would have an engine rescue, Paxtonia would have an engine rescue and Linglestown would have an engine, tanker and the aerial. He noted that all three fire companies have an extra engine identified as 33-1, 34-1 and 35-1. He questioned if they should be kept or sell them and use the proceeds to offset the costs of the new apparatus that should be purchased soon.

Mr. Hawk noted that the two ladder trucks plus an engine would cost roughly \$2.3 million. PSD Johnson noted that since he wrote the study he spoke to Chief Swank and was told that they did \$13,000 worth of work on the Quint to take care of some rust and other issues and he has indicated that it could probably be used for a couple of years. He noted that Chief Swank would prefer to replace their oldest engine which is a 2000 year model that is scheduled to be replaced next year. He noted that it would cost a lot less than a ladder truck.

Mr. Hawk questioned if you sell the three engines but you keep one as a reserve you would only be selling two engines. He questioned what kind of money you would get when you sell an engine. PSD Johnson suggested that a professional should be able to provide an appraisal but he would suggest that Colonial Park may get from \$125,000 to \$150,000 for their engine. He noted that Linglestown's Engine 35-1 is used for brush fires on the mountain, a piece of equipment that they purchased with money that they raised. He noted that more discussion would need to be had on that piece of equipment as it is not Township-owned, but it has been identified as being redundant. Mr. Hawk noted that it would cost about \$2 million to purchase the equipment needed at this time. PSD Johnson noted that all the equipment that is being replaced would be sold as well as the redundant pieces with the proceeds put toward the purchase of the new apparatus.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Fire Equipment Capital Fund will, after making this year's contribution, contain about \$1.4 million. He noted that the Board has purchased fire equipment in the past when there was not enough money in the fund and loaned what was necessary to

make the purchase from the General Fund with the Fire Equipment Capital Fund repaying the General Fund from future year's contribution. He noted if you look at \$1.4 million plus the sale of three units, you should come pretty close to the \$2 million mark, only needing minor borrowing from the General Fund. Mr. Crissman questioned if that money would be used to pay back the loan that had been extended. Mr. Wolfe answered that loan has been satisfied.

Ms. Lindsey questioned how many pieces of apparatus are 15 years or older. PSD Johnson answered that it is six. Ms. Lindsey questioned how old is Ladder 33 and Ladder 35. PSD Johnson answered that Ladder 33 is a 1998 model and Ladder 35 is a 2000 model. Ms. Lindsey questioned what the difference is between a ladder truck and a tiller. PSD Johnson answered that they are all ladder trucks, but Colonial Park's unit is a Quint, 75 foot in length. He noted that those trucks only need one driver but the tiller needs two drivers. Ms. Lindsey noted that the tiller does exactly the same thing as a ladder truck but it takes two people to drive it. PSD Johnson answered that Paxtonia's ladder does not have water and a pump but he recommended when they replace that unit they get something that has at least 300 gallons of water so if it is the first piece of apparatus on the scene, they would have the initial knock down to get into where they need to get. He noted that he is not sure that Paxtonia would agree to that but that would be his recommendation.

Ms. Lindsey noted that PSD Johnson recommended that they do work orders for the apparatus and she questioned if they have been doing that now. PSD Johnson answered that all of the service on their equipment is handled by the fire companies. He explained that we do not know anything about it, unless they would come to the Board looking for funds from the Fire Equipment Capital Fund. Ms. Lindsey questioned if the Board should know what is going on and that they are keeping up with the maintenance for the equipment. PSD answered that it would be his recommendation that the Public Safety Director, for all apparatus owned by the Township, should have detailed records on the maintenance for the apparatus. He noted that he should be supplied with a work order every time it is serviced showing what is being done and the cost. He noted that the work order should be approved prior to seeking service.

Mr. Hawk questioned if you place an order for a truck, how long would it take for delivery. PSD Johnson answered that it would be eight months to a year. Mr. Wolfe noted if you throw in next year's contribution to the Fire Equipment Capital Plan it would take up to \$1.6

million, and with the sale of three units, you should be able to cover the cost of the equipment at this point. He noted that the issue would be for when the rehabilitated Colonial Park Quint comes due in two to three years, you will have about \$400,000 in a plan that has to buy a \$1 million piece of equipment at which time you would have to borrow from the General Fund.

Mr. Hawk noted that the good news is there does not seem to be any safety concerns. PSD Johnson responded that he met with the fire chiefs and there is nothing that would indicated that any of the apparatus currently in use in Lower Paxton Township should be immediately removed from service. He noted that anything 25 years or older should be removed from service; however, there are communities that have apparatus as old as 37 years that they are still using. He noted that is why it is important to have the detailed records of maintenance. He noted that a decision has to be made if it makes sense to continue to maintain a piece of apparatus that may cost too much to keep in service. He noted that we have no safety issues with any of the apparatus at this time but you have to take into consideration that it takes about a year to get new equipment.

Mr. Wolfe noted if we have \$1.6 million by next year and sell the old equipment, maybe getting \$150,000 for each, we would be pretty close for what we need. PSD Johnson noted that the longer we go, the less we would get for the resale of the equipment.

Mr. Crissman noted that we need to develop a replacement cycle for the equipment as it helps for budgeting purposes as well. He noted if we keep a set amount in the line item each year we know what it will be as opposed to taking a major hit that would have a huge impact on the taxpayers.

PSD Johnson noted if you are looking at 15 on the low end or 18 years on the high end for replacement for an engine and 18 years to 20 years for a ladder, noting that the Township is not running 20 to 30 calls per day, you could stretch it out to the max. He noted that it is reasonable as long as the equipment is properly maintained.

Ms. Lindsey questioned how old is the tiller at Paxtonia. PSD Johnson noted that it is a 1998 model. Ms. Lindsey noted that the longer you wait, the equipment will be a year older before you can trade them in.

Mr. Crissman noted that his replacement cycle comments are parallel to his debt service for the municipality, believing level debt service as he believes in level debt service when it

comes to bond issues, this is a great parallel that we have a level debt service for the replacement of the equipment and by keeping accurate records we can set a certain amount aside each year and bump it if we need to, not taking advantage of the taxpayers. PSD Johnson noted that some of the redundant apparatus is also on the schedule to be replaced and it won't have to be replaced now.

Ms. Lindsey questioned when we last purchased equipment. PSD Johnson answered in 2009, Engine 34-1. He noted that prior to that it was 2008, Truck 35.

Mr. Hawk questioned how soon we are expected to act on this. Mr. Wolfe answered that this is informational only until the Board meets with the fire chiefs which would be part of the initial 2016 budget discussions which usually starts in August.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the chiefs have a copy of the study. PSD Johnson answered no, but he did speak to each chief about it and it was determined to provide them with a copy after tonight's meeting. He noted that he asked the chiefs not to attend the meeting since the Board had a full agenda noting that they will be scheduled to meet with the Board sometime in the near future.

Ms. Lindsey thanked PSD Johnson for the report as it provided good information.

Discussion with representatives of Penn Waste regarding the
agreement with the Township to purchase recyclables

Mr. Wolfe introduced Ed Ward and Eric Sentz who are present to discuss the agreement with Penn Waste for recyclable materials.

Mr. Ward noted that he is the municipal contract manager with Penn Waste and Eric Sentz is the CFO. He noted that he is present to discuss the 2008 agreement for the sale of recyclable materials. He noted that it is also known as the recycling processing agreement. He noted that the materials are delivered to the Penn Waste site by the current collector, Waste Management, where it is processed by splitting it apart, turning it into the individual commodities. He noted that he then sells that. He noted that the agreement provides for him to share some of those revenues with the Township. He noted that a formula was used with the original agreement that was based upon an index that was discounted from the contamination factor of 17.5% and reduced further by a processing cost of \$25 a ton. He noted that the rebate

would be shared with the Township. He noted if the rebate value was below \$15, that was the floor rate and he would never go below \$15. He noted that the Township has been in that agreement with Penn Waste since 2008 with an initial term of five years, with five one-year options. He noted that year seven is coming to an end.

Mr. Ward explained that that he met with Mr. Wolfe and Mr. Shoaff and explained that the model is no longer feasible for Penn Waste. He proposed a different type of agreement, noting that the large factor for this type of agreement is the processing costs and they have dramatically increased over time. He noted that he would invite all the Board members to visit the facility to see what is involved in the process. He noted that the commodities market have soften dramatically.

Mr. Ward explained that the new proposal deals with the processing costs and the floor. He noted that the processing costs was increased from \$25 to \$50 and the floor was decreased from \$15 to \$5. He noted in today's values, the payback to the Township you would be at the \$5 floor rate.

Mr. Ward noted by having the index in the agreement, if the recycling values come back, then the Township would be protected under this type of agreement. He noted that having a formula index would protect the Township in that you would see that benefit again. He noted that we cannot continue with the current agreement and that is why he is approaching the Township with a new agreement.

Mr. Hawk questioned if Mr. Ward's proposal is based on the OBM. Mr. Ward answered yes, noting the only change from the current contract are the increase in the processing cost from \$25 to \$50 and the floor price decrease from \$15 to \$5. He noted that the OBM would continue to be a part of the agreement. Mr. Hawk noted that the current agreement expires the end of June, noting that cardboard has gone from \$53.80. Mr. Ward noted that currently it is around \$20. He noted that it would be a negative amount and the floor would protect the Township from ever having to pay for its recyclables. He noted that it would go from \$20 to \$5 and in today's environment that is the difference. He noted that your other option is to put it out for bid but looking where the cardboard market is, it is a possibility that you could also be faced with a charge. He noted that the new agreement protects the Township.

Mr. Hawk noted under the old agreement the Township was charged \$25 for processing and now you are up to \$50. He questioned why there is so much difference from one contract to the next one. Mr. Ward explained that the agreement has been in place for seven years, and a number of things have changed from a technology standpoint. He noted that they have optical sorters and he feels that it is a realistic charge.

Mr. Hawk noted that the only way it would be more financially rewarding for the Township is to have the residents recycle more material.

Mr. Seeds questioned how we could do a new contract between now and the end of the month as you provided the 30-day notice. Mr. Ward stated that he would be willing to work with the Township. He noted that we have been partners for seven years and if we have to agree for an additional month, then that is what he will do.

Mr. Seeds questioned when the Township's contract with Waste Management ends. Mr. Wolfe answered that it is June 30, 2018.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if Waste Management has a recycling program. Mr. Wolfe answered yes, but when we entered into the program with Penn Waste we compared an offer from Waste Management with the offer from Penn Waste.

Ms. Lindsey questioned why the costs went up so much. Mr. Sentsz answered that the costs have been going up for a lot of reasons. He noted when single stream came into existence, it was a great thing as it added a lot more volume, but the complication is that people put contaminants into the single stream. He explained when he put the plant into place, he not only had to separate all the good stuff, but he had to pull out all the stuff that is not recyclable. He noted that you can educate the people and put flyers out but there is still a large amount of contamination. He noted that he upgraded his equipment to be able to pull some of it out and he had to add people, noting that it is a tuff job to separate the plastics and pull out trash that is put in. He noted that over time, he had to add labor and equipment and the maintenance on the equipment is a lot more complicated. He noted in addition to that the markets have dropped noting that it is almost like a perfect storm.

Mr. Seeds noted that several Board members visited the site, but you have since moved. Mr. Sentsz answered that he just built a brand new facility that opened in March. He explained that the monitoring separators are still the same, but it is more difficult to separate the stuff.

Mr. Hawk noted under the new contract there are certain things that are prohibitive like tires and chemicals. Mr. Sentz noted that the new plant opened in March and he happened to be taking a tour of the facility when a brick, the size of a wheel, dropped into the machine and it shut it down. He noted that the equipment runs quicker but it is harder to pick that stuff out. Mr. Hawk noted that the Township needs to educate the public that certain things are not allowed to be put in the recycling. Mr. Sentz noted that education is very important and it can increase the tonnage dramatically.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the items that can be recycled has changed. Mr. Ward answered that Penn Waste added a few items effective January 1st, such as orange juice cartons and cardboard soup containers. Mr. Seeds noted that people need to be notified if this. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township makes notification as part of the Newsletter and all of the publication documents.

Mr. Seeds questioned if we were to extend this agreement beyond this contract of June 30th, we would have to have an agreement for the new amount. He questioned if Mr. Ward would accept the current amount after July 1st. Mr. Ward noted if it is a month, he is fine with that.

Mr. Crissman noted that since this is a workshop meeting and we are seeing this for the first time, he noted that the new proposal may be the lowest price buy he has an obligation to the community to get the best price for the services being rendered so he is asking for consideration for another quote.

Ms. Lindsey noted if we are receiving around \$50,000 to \$60,000 for recyclables now, under the new program what would we receive. Mr. Ward answered it would be about \$1,500 a month. Mr. Wolfe suggested that is what we were receiving in 2014 although the first five months of this year have been much lower.

Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Ward, if the Board decided to go out for a Request for Proposal would your pencil get sharpened. Mr. Ward answered if you go somewhere else you may find out that you will be charged for recyclables.

Presentation by the Friendship Center Operating Board
regarding a priority improvement project for the Center

Mr. Hawk noted that the Friendship Center Operating Board was unable to meet last night due to the weather conditions and as such, this item will be pulled from the agenda.

Discussion with Richard Yingst regarding the status of the
Shadebrook subdivision and developer's agreement

Mr. Jeff Staub, Dauphin Engineering, noted that Richard Yingst, the owner of the Shadebrook project and John Zervanos were also present to discuss the agreement. He noted that Mr. Zervanos had indicated that Mr. Wolfe wanted to meet with the Board to discuss the status of the Shadebrook project and to explain where we were in the construction process.

Mr. Staub noted that he is working on Phase One, located at the northwest corner of the property. He noted in the past six months, the site work has started, two new streets have been constructed, and almost all of the earthwork has been completed, as well as the sanitary sewer construction, storm sewer construction and water line. He noted in about a month, the concrete curb and some of the base course paving will be constructed on the two new streets in Phase One.

Mr. Staub noted that yesterday, the site contractor had installed signage to close down Fairmont Drive and a portion of Cider Press Road so that Fairmont Drive can be reconstructed. He noted that work will take about six to eight weeks, noting that the work was to begin immediately after school ended to avoid the bus traffic. He noted that the reconstruction of Fairmont Drive will be finished the end of July.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if you are coming off of Union Deposit Road, there is no access to Fairmont Drive. Mr. Staub stated that is correct.

Mr. Staub noted for the Board's meeting next week, he will provide the Township with a Letter of Credit, and a Developer's agreement. He noted that comments were received from Mr. Stine and staff and he adjusted the comments and by the end of the week, the Township should receive a revised Developer's Agreement along with a letter of credit.

Mr. Hawk question if Mr. Stine wanted to make any comments in regard to the Letter of Credit. Mr. Stine answered that those comments were provided in writing to Mr. Staub. Mr.

Staub noted that he addressed those comments in the revised Developers Agreement that will be available for next week's meeting.

Mr. Stine noted that one comment was not addressed in regards to payment for the right-of-way for acquisition at the intersection of Fairmont Drive and Locust Lane. Mr. Staub noted that Mr. Zervanos did research on that, noting that the original Developer's Agreement for the original Shadebrook project, did indicate that the Township would bear that expense. Mr. Stine questioned if there was a previous Developer's Agreement. Mr. Yingst noted that it was notes written down from prior meetings. Mr. Wolfe noted that he had a copy of those notes. Mr. Staub stated that it speaks to the acquisition and that the Township would take care of that. Mr. Stine noted that it would be up to the Board if it wants to take responsibility for that.

Mr. Staub noted that next Tuesday, he would hope that the Board would approve the Developer's Agreement and the Letter of Credit. He noted if the Board does so, then the next step for him would be to record the subdivision and land development plan and he would anticipate doing that next Thursday. He noted that the Township is working on three building permits for the first three homes in Phase One. He noted if he can get the plan recorded next Thursday that will allow him to pull the three building permits on Friday and start construction on the first three homes on June 22nd.

Mr. Staub noted after Phase One is recorded, it was Mr. Yingst's intention to begin engineering design for the project as he will start the PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) application and the PennDOT Traffic Signal Permit application. He noted that next step will be taken as soon as the plan is recorded. He noted in order for that work to be completed and the application submitted to PennDOT, the Township needs to take care of the issue for the right-of-ways. Mr. Hawk noted that you need this before you can start building. Mr. Staub noted that he can start working on the design but the first permit won't be issued until it is determined what right-of-ways might be required. He noted that he is not sure how much that would be yet but it needs to be taken care of prior to PennDOT issuing the HOP and traffic signal permit.

Mr. Crissman noted that all the issues need to be resolved by next Tuesday, will they be completed and ready. Mr. Staub answered that the two outstanding items are the financial security which is going to be a letter of credit, and the Developer's Agreement. He noted that the Township needs to sign off on those two documents which he hopes will occur next Tuesday.

He noted once the plan is recorded, then he can start pulling building permits and home construction. He noted that he only mentioned the traffic signal issue to keep the Board aware of the timing of the traffic signal for Locust Lane and Fairmont Drive. He noted that it does not have to be resolved now.

Mr. Crissman questioned, to avoid any conflicts for next Tuesday night, he does not want to hear that all of this is done but and if there is a "but", he will have a major problem and he does not want to have a conflict next Tuesday night. He questioned if everything can be done before Tuesday night otherwise he would suggest not to come.

Mr. Staub noted that Mr. Wolfe needs the information for the packets on Friday.

Ms. Lindsey questioned from the time that you apply for the HOP until the light is installed and working, how long will that be. Mr. Staub suggested that the engineering, road work and traffic signal design, submittal to PennDOT and securing their review, trading comment letters back and forth, it would take at least a year. She questioned how many houses would be built before the light is working. Mr. Yingst stated that he hopes a lot of homes are built, but it would take about six months for occupancy.

Mr. Seeds noted that the only question is the cost of condemnation.

Mr. John Zervanos noted that the way the Developers Agreement was created with the initial Shadebrook Plan that was preliminarily approved was that there was a list of items that needed to be attached to the Developer's Agreement. He noted that some of the items went away because of the change in the plan. He noted that many things remained, for example the illuminated fountain in the pond. He noted that there was a dialogue for who would take care of what for the traffic signal. He noted that he has paperwork that said that the Township would provide all the necessary right-of-ways at its cost. He noted that he mirrored everything that was agreed upon originally. Mr. Seeds questioned if that was from his minutes from meetings. Mr. Zervanos noted that he received a certified letter from Lower Paxton Township that listed all the various conditions. He noted that some was from HRG. Mr. Wolfe questioned where he found that in the certified mail as he found it in the notes that were attached to it. Mr. Zervanos noted when he received the letter, it was included with it. Mr. Wolfe explained that he can't speak to that as he thought they were Mr. Zervanos' notes. Mr. Zervanos noted that they were not his

notes. Mr. Stine questioned if Mr. Zervanos had the approval letter. He noted that it does not say it in the approval letter and this is the first time that he saw that document.

Mr. Zervanos noted when they revised the plan they kept anything that was pertinent in the Developer's Agreement. Mr. Stine noted that the last time we met was the first time that Mr. Zervanos was involved and that was a year or so ago. He noted that he remembered when this issue came up and you had asked us if the Township was willing to pay for the right-of-way and Mr. Wolfe's response was, it depends on how much right-of-way we have to acquire. He noted that he did not remember agreeing to anything. Mr. Wolfe noted that he has no recent recollection, and he has no recollection from 2008 for what was agreed to. He questioned Mr. Zervanos if the notes came from the Township. Mr. Zervanos answered that is correct. Mr. Seeds questioned if there was a signature on it. Mr. Zervanos noted what he found in the file was a letter from Lower Paxton Township. Mr. Stine noted that is the approval letter for the plan which is not related to those other things that you have. Mr. Zervanos noted that it was for the preliminary plan. Mr. Stine noted that the letter contains the conditions but the other attachment was not part of the conditions unless the letter says it is.

Mr. Zervanos noted that one of the memorandums was from Lori Wissler and it talked about an arch culvert underneath Cider Press Road, then there is an attachment of items included in the Developer's Agreement that talks about an arch culvert. Mr. Stine noted that it does not mean that they were created by the same person. He noted that there is no name on the list of items that he could see. Mr. Staub noted that it is a draft of the Supervisors October 7th meeting. Mr. Stine suggested that he did not think the Township created that document.

Mr. Seeds noted that he wants to clarify this so it is not a problem next week. He noted if it was agreed to then it should be that way but that is what he is trying to figure out and he would like to resolve it. He noted that we need to know if we agreed to that and he does not know how to do that. Mr. Zervanos noted that he provided Mr. Wolfe a copy of it. Mr. Stine suggested that we need to check our file to see what is in it.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he is reviewing the approved minutes from the October 7, 2008 meeting.

Mr. Seeds noted that it could be a big issue. He questioned which phase of the project is the traffic light needed as soon as the HOP is completed. Mr. Yingst answered that is correct. Mr. Seeds noted that traffic light has been needed for a long time.

Mr. Yingst noted that he knew about the issues for getting a right-of-way in a public area and that is why he agreed to do the intersection but he is sure that he did not have that in the agreement. Mr. Seeds noted that he did not recall who would pay for the right-of-way but he knows that he was happy that the traffic light was going in.

Mr. Crissman noted that we should do the research and then get back to the Board.

Ms. Lindsey questioned what houses would you be building in two weeks. Mr. Yingst answered that he is starting with a cape cod, a ranch, and a two-story home.

Mr. Wolfe read from the minutes, "Mr. Hornung questioned if the developer would be applying for the permits. Mr. Troutman answered, that as part of the developer's agreement, he would include the traffic study, which was already completed, the construction engineering, construction of the improvements, costs to prepare the permit application, bonding the intersection improvements, the Township would be named in the permit, and the Township would provide the necessary right-of-ways. He noted that this project would be completed as soon as the PennDOT Highway Occupancy Permit (HOP) was issued, and the final plan approval for Phase I was received." Mr. Wolfe suggested that additional research in regards to the plan would be appropriate. Mr. Seeds questioned who made the statement. Mr. Wolfe noted that it was Mr. Troutman or Mr. Mellott.

Mr. Crissman suggested that we should continue the research and then respond back to Mr. Yingst. Mr. Wolfe noted that we will have an answer for next Tuesday night.

Review of a proposal from GHD Engineers regarding architectural service for the proposed addition to the Public Works facility

Mr. Wolfe noted that Lower Paxton Township plans to expand its existing Public Works Facility, a 16,000 square foot addition to include a garage area primarily but also staff office space and truck wash facility. He noted the initial schematic was provided by CET who later became GHD and prior to moving further on the project he felt that it would be good to entertain a proposal from GHD in regards to architectural services for design for the building addition.

Mr. Esten Rusten, GHD, noted that back in 2011 he did a preliminary study for the expansion working closely with the Township and came up with a plan that offered the Township what they needed for the Public Works facility. He noted that he has done work for the Sewer Department in that same site and is familiar with the area. He noted, over the last four to five years he has been able to revisit it as the Township comes closer to doing the work. He noted that he has made some revisions to the proposal as some things have been pulled from the project and some have been added and he feels that he has a good competitive number. He noted that the group that they have at GHD does architectural work and has a lot of history on this project and GHD is looking forward to offering their services.

Mr. Seeds noted that the proposal mentions Cox Engineering, and he questioned if their services would be part of your fee. Mr. Stanley answered yes. Mr. Seeds questioned if it would be included in the \$168,000 proposal. Mr. Seeds noted that the ARM Group is a separate group. He noted that HRG is also working on this project.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if GHD had to bring in Cox Engineering because GHD firm does not do what they do. Mr. Stanley answered that GHD does not do HVAC work. He noted that they were used as sub-consultants when we did the Sewer Building back in 2003.

Mr. Stanley noted that GHD had some concerns in regard to this proposal. He noted that there was a change in Township staff from the time that we started this project to the present time. He noted that one concern that he has is that it was set up with a certain goal in mind and he needs to sit down and make sure what he is envisioning is what the Township is still envisioning. He noted that you talk about the truck lifts, well they are quite expensive. He noted that a decision has to be made if you want those, simple things like that have to be taken care of. He noted that we need to enter this project with an idea that we have a budget that the Township has to stay within and we have to offer to the maintenance people a facility that they need to operate properly so it is a two-way thing. He noted that GHD needs to work closely with HRG to ensure that the project fits with what they are doing. He noted that it would not be good to find out that the gas lines or water service doesn't match up. He noted that he needs to work closely with them on the entire project.

Mr. Seeds noted that the former Public Works Director wanted an automatic car wash and you are proposing a manual car wash. Mr. Stanley noted in a meeting with Jeff Kline, it was

mentioned that they were rethinking the entire process and it is one of the things that needs to be worked out. He noted that it is big ticket item that may go away. He noted that they discussed an interior vehicle washer where you would bring in a truck and quickly hose it down. He noted that they would have to have an indoor facility with a chassis wash to get the salt off. Mr. Seeds suggested that Mr. Wolfe was a part of the discussion and maybe staff has decided that it is better not to go with the automatic vehicle washer. Mr. Wolfe noted that a full automatic washer is not necessary, just a chassis wash facility with an automatic base would suffice.

Mr. Crissman noted that all this discussion has to occur before we get to see the drawings. He noted that form follows function, noting that function must come first. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is premature to talk about form until you retain the design professional.

Mr. Seeds questioned how we could compare the fee to what they are proposing. Mr. Wolfe noted that you have a project budget of \$4 million for construction and he questioned Mr. Stanley what percent of the entire project would it represent. Mr. Stanley answered that it is less than 5%. Mr. Wolfe noted that he did not know if you could do better because we haven't done an RFP but less than 5% on a facility design for a metal building is a relatively good price.

Mr. Seeds questioned if it has already been decided to build a metal building. Mr. Wolfe answered yes as this is what was discussed all along. Mr. Stanley noted that the original proposal was based on that and it was based on meshing together the two buildings. He noted you currently have a metal frame structure so it would mesh in with that.

Mr. Crissman noted that we are looking at what GHD can do for us as a professional service or we can choose to do an RFP. Mr. Hawk noted that 5% is a reasonable figure. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it is very reasonable.

Ms. Lindsey noted for the automatic wash, is a state regulation or through DEP, is it okay to have a manual one instead of the automatic. Mr. Wolfe answered that DEP does not mandate that we wash our equipment only that if we wash it that it is in a facility that captures the wash water and properly treats it, recycles it or transmits it to a sewage facility. He noted that part of the reason for this facility is that the trucks are in a very harsh environment and we invest a lot of money in them and if you don't get the salt off in the winter you lose a truck before its time.

Ms. Lindsey noted that a neighboring Township was fined because it didn't have a wash. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it was the way that they were washing the vehicles. He noted if they

were spraying the equipment off on a parking lot that is not allowed. Mr. Seeds noted that you have to have a filtering system.

Mr. Crissman questioned if we should decide to do an RFP, will that change your numbers. Mr. Stanley said no. He noted that his numbers are based upon the effort it would take to do the work. He noted that it is 4.2% of the overall project.

Mr. Wolfe questioned if he should put this on the agenda for Tuesday's meeting. Ms. Lindsey suggested that it should be put on for the business meeting because we deal with GHD through the Sewer Department and we are lucky to have them. Mr. Seeds agreed to put it on the agenda. Mr. Hawk agreed and Mr. Crissman noted that he is comfortable putting it on the agenda.

Ms. Lindsey noted that Mr. Wolfe stated that 5% is a good price and if it is 4.2% then it should be a good price. Mr. Stanley noted that it is a good price for architectural services noting that conventional guidelines normally suggest that 6 or 7% would go for those services. He noted for this type of construction that it too high. He noted that certain things go away with a metal building but you still have all the internal finishes. He noted that he can make it more efficient from his end.

Status report regarding site design for the Public Works building addition,
Babe Ruth baseball field, and Magisterial District Justice Office

Mr. Andrew Kenworthy noted that HRG has been engaged to design the site work for GHD's planning design for the Public Works Building (PWB), the location for the baseball field, and a parcel to the north along Locust Lane for the Magisterial District Judge's (MDJ) Office. He explained that he has started the transition from a concept drawing to an engineering drawing that will be used for any permitting required and also construction.

Mr. Kenworthy noted to the right of the drawing is the existing PWB and the darker area, the larger rectangle and the smaller rectangle is what GHD was referring to in their proposal for the design work for the building. He noted that the smaller rectangle to the top of the two larger buildings would be the truck wash area. He noted in the middle you can see the revised baseball field, including fencing, dugouts, backstops, and bleacher area, and to the left is the parcel designated for the MDJ Office. He noted that the major component that he has been given

direction for is to have the field in for the fall for the first seeding so that it can get established and receive a second seeding in the spring. He noted that one component that he is working into the design to help that along is to sod the infield and the first ring of the outfield. He noted that it will establish the field on day one right away. He noted that the remainder of the area should be established for a fall and spring growing season. He noted that he will be getting the permitting and grading done for the entire site to include the erosion control, designing stormwater with the proposed design and improvements. He noted that he would work closely with GHD if they are the one's chosen to do the design for the building to make sure HRG's site design is fully coordinated with their building design. He noted that he wants to make sure that the utilities are coming in at the right area and slopes and entrances are at the right elevation. He noted that he will work closely with GHD to ensure that those two pieces are knit together as well.

Mr. Kenworthy noted at the same time, Dauphin County is working on a sales and development agreement with the Township. He suggested that it is still in the planning stages and once the full site is graded and established, when GHD comes in with their project the Public Works Building can be designed and built, and Dauphin County will take the front parcel and work on incorporating their design separate from the Township.

Mr. Kenworthy noted that he is on track and is getting ready to submit the permits and finalizing the design, having met with Township staff to include the Parks and Recreation Department to discuss some maintenance issues and operational issues that he is incorporating into the design to get it to the final layout.

Mr. Wolfe questioned if Mr. Kenworthy had a tentative bid schedule. Mr. Kenworthy answered that he expects to bid the project in July with an August and September construction start.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there are two features of the plan that he would like to touch on, the retaining walls that will not be high in height. Mr. Kenworthy explained that there are retaining walls and he is continuing to tweak the design a little bit. He noted if you look behind the first base line, where the dugout would be, there is a wall that extends behind the backstop. He noted that he is working to eliminate that retaining wall. He noted that walls are costly and he is trying to eliminate that wall. He explained that he is trying to coordinate the wall for grading purposes or add it as a seating feature, where they could sit on the wall to watch the game. He noted that

there is also a wall on right field at the foul pole. He noted that the site is narrow and he is looking at to maximize the right field foul pole, the distance to the fence. He noted that he needs to put a small wall, about 4 feet high to get the corner onto the property. He noted that there is a wall in left field, with the field being so large, it needs to be flat with a minimum slope. He noted with the extension of the PWB coming out at the same elevation so the trucks can pull through from the new facility to the existing facility, the elevation must be kept the same, at a lower elevation. He noted that the wall exists between the left field foul pole and the PWB. He noted that the field will be up high and the building down low so they can do all their operations at that level, and there will be a fence at the top with safety features associated with it.

Mr. Hawk questioned if there is a wall in centerfield. Mr. Kenworthy answered no. He noted that the left field wall is longer than the right field wall but there is no wall in between.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the other feature is storm water management, especially for the MDJ office as it will be on the Township property. Mr. Kenworthy noted as part of the sales and development agreement that is currently being proposed, he is designing the site as one site looking to permit it as such. He noted in order to accommodate all of the facilities, we are looking to share storm water facilities so where the new public works addition is going, we are looking to put a stormwater control facility in there, designed in accordance with all the standards of the Township and BMP. He noted that there will be a cross access easement for stormwater so not only will the Township property utilize it, but the MDJ office will have stormwater directed to that location as well. He noted that it limited some of the disturbance to the north of the property and concentrates it in one area.

Mr. Seeds questioned if there would be the same amenities for the new ball field as there was for the current ball field. Mr. Kenworthy answered that you will find a cleaner area behind home plate and the spectator and dugout areas. He noted that he is looking to provide a concrete area behind the backstop where people can sit on chairs or bleachers. He noted that the baseball field is Babe Ruth size so it is made to accommodate those needs. Mr. Seeds noted that there are bleachers and a dugout at that location. Mr. Wolfe noted that there is no dugout at that location at this time. Mr. Kenworthy noted that it will have the same basic ball field features.

Mr. Seeds noted that there is a problem with balls that go over the fence and strike the existing Public Works Building. He questioned if this should be better or about the same. Mr.

Kenworthy answered that you have two fields now, so the field closest to the Public Works Building will be further north and the field further away will move closer to become one field. He noted the closest part from the ball field to the Public Works Building will be the addition where the trucks will pull in to the new pull through area. He noted if balls are being hit to the existing Public Works Building you probably have a major leaguer on your hands. He noted that there will still be a potential for balls to go over the fence, noting that you are looking at over 260 feet from home plate to the driveway apron for the Public Works building.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the work is under the existing contract. Mr. Wolfe noted that there is no contract to approve as we have a letter of proposal from HRG that the Board approved to do this work.

Mr. Seeds questioned once you are ready to do this we will have to bid the actual construction. Mr. Wolfe answered that was correct. Mr. Seeds questioned when you will have the bid ready to go. Mr. Kenworthy answered July. He noted that it depends on the permitting issues but he is pushing those as quickly as possible.

Mr. Crissman noted that since we will have three projects going on at the same time, who is going to be the coordinator, who will involve all three parties. He noted that he has a concern that one group will do one thing and the other another thing and wind up with a water pipe under home base and ten years from now home base has to be torn up and we have the community upset because we can't use the ball field for a season. He noted that he wants to know out of the three teams will be the contact person and that they will talk to one another so this does not occur. He noted if it does he will be the first person yelling and screaming. Mr. Kenworthy noted that HRG is designing the entire site in its entirety to accommodate the MDJ Office, the baseball field and Public Works expansion. He noted that he will look at all those in tandem to accommodate the items for each parcel so when the ball grading and initial work is done for the ball field, and when the Public Works construction is started the utilities are already established from the original design to accommodate what needs to happen during that construction and again with the MDJ office he is looking at the utilities and access and those sorts of things so it will be ready for their plans.

Mr. Crissman noted that there is only one person responsible, Mr. Kenworthy.

Ms. Lindsey noted with the sod being laid, do we have the capability to water it if we don't get any rain. Mr. Kenworthy answered that we are talking about that now as to how it would be irrigated. He noted that we are not looking at an in ground irrigation system, but probably pulling water from a field hydrant or the Public Works Building with a hose and a mobile irrigator.

Mr. Kenworthy noted that we have identified the three different uses and can accommodate for the future develop of those. He noted as they come in separately they would be ready to go independently.

Status report regarding the Arts and Parks 5k run/walk,
as being planned by the Community Engagement Committee

Mr. Bruce Senft noted that the Community Engagement Committee (CEC) is sponsoring a 5k run on Saturday, July 18, 2015. He explained that he wanted to provide a brief update on the event. He noted that registration starts at 7 a.m. and the race starts at 8 a.m. rain or shine. He noted that the cost is \$20 to register and for children 14 to 9 the cost is \$10, with no charge for children under nine years of age. He noted that you can also walk for \$10. He noted that they will have kid's activities throughout the race time, starting at 7 a.m. through 9 a.m. He explained that the course will start and end at the Friendship Center and there are cash prizes. He noted that he has developed some marketing materials that he distributed to the Board members. He explained that it is a design of a post card that is being printed by Triangle Press donating their services to print the postcard and posters that will be similar to it as part of the distribution and marketing efforts for the 5k run.

Mr. Senft noted that the CEC has been fairly successful in getting sponsors for the 5k race. He noted that Highway and Equipment and Supplies is the titled sponsor for the race. He noted other sponsors are: Conrad Siegel Investment Advisors, Inc., Brown and Brown Insurance; Sedun Shaklee Independent Distributors, Drayer Physical Therapy, and Baptist Resource Network. He noted that he is looking to get two more sponsors to help with the program. He explained that we raised more money this year than we did last year, with a goal of \$10,000, noting if we get 200 runners we will be close to that figure.

Mr. Senft noted in terms of marketing for the event we are moving into that phase of the project to get the runners. He noted that we have someone on the Committee who has marketing experience with PennDOT, Carl Defebo, who has been very helpful with the process. He noted that we will be distributing the post cards to a variety of places throughout the Township. He noted that they have contacted runner groups to put the information on their website as well as the local schools. He noted that they will also be doing local public service announcements and using word of mouth to promote the events. He noted that the Committee is pretty excited about where we are today and if we get 100 runners that will be twice as many as we had last year. He noted if we can double this every year, ten years from now it will be a significant event for the Township. He thanked the Board for its support and the CEC would be very grateful for any help that it can provide to promote the race.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the Committee is still looking for volunteers. Mr. Senft answered yes as they can use volunteers starting at 6:45 a.m. He noted that there is a lot of logistics involved with the race because of the way the course is laid out. He noted that we will need 20 or more volunteers for the day.

Ms. Lindsey questioned if it was on the website. Mr. Senft answered yes. She questioned if someone wanted to participate and write a check who would they make it out to and where would they send it. Mr. Senft answered that you would make the check out to Lower Paxton Township, with a note that it is for the 5k race and drop it off at the Friendship Center.

Mr. Crissman noted if you make a donation of \$100 or more, your name will be listed on the T-shirt. Mr. Senft answered that is correct as Mr. and Mrs. Crissman have done that.

“Otta Know” Presentation: The Township’s 2015 Actuarial Valuations for its pension plans

Mr. Wolfe requested to postpone this agenda item until the next meeting due to Mr. Hornung’s absence.

Improvement Guarantees

Mr. Hawk noted that there were two Improvement Guarantees and one Operations and Maintenance Agreement.

Chelsey Falls, Phase II

A reduction in a letter of credit with Orrstown Bank in the amount of \$151,585.50, with an expiration date of March 17, 2016.

Hoffman Ford Sales – Lighting Plan

A new escrow with Lower Paxton Township in the amount of \$21,988.00 with an expiration date of June 9, 2016.

Operations and Maintenance Agreement

An Operations and Maintenance Agreement with Hoffman Ford Sales, Inc, for a Highway Occupancy Permit for the maintenance of a stormwater culvert depicted as Exhibit A.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the two Improvement Guarantees and one Operations and Maintenance Agreement. Ms. Lindsey seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Adjournment

Mrs. Lindsey made a motion to adjourn the meeting, and Mr. Hawk adjourned the meeting at 8:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

William L. Hornung
Township Secretary