

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Workshop April 29, 2014

A special workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Chairman William B. Hawk, on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

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

Also in attendance was George Wolfe, Township Manager; Sam Robbins, Public Works Department; Matt Miller, Public Works; Brian Luetchford, Parks and Recreation Director; David Johnson, Public Safety Director; David Hogentogler, Human Resource Manager, Tim Houck, Finance Director; William Weaver, Sewer Authority Director; and Watson Fisher, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

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

Public Comment

No comments were provided.

Review of Moody's Rating Report and the
Preliminary Official Statement for the issuance of \$32 million in bonds

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board is considering a bond issue of \$32 million dollars; \$25 million for the ongoing sanitary sewer projects that will be guaranteed by a Subsidy Agreement with the Lower Paxton Township Sewer Authority, and a \$7 million General Obligation Bond guaranteed by the full faith and taxing dollars of Lower Paxton Township. He explained that the Township has received its new Moody's rating that has improved from the previous rating in that the Township continues to be a Aa2 but the negative outlook has been removed. He noted that Moody's stated that the Township has restored its fund balance and that the operating revenues on a year-end basis have stabilized with expenditures. He noted that two things that were of concern to Moody's moving forward is the significant amount of debt the Authority has and if it had a problem, the debt would be pledged against the taxpayers in the Township. He suggested that any future borrowing may be better if it is a straight buy by the Authority itself as opposed to borrowing through General Obligation status and having it guaranteed by a Subsidy

Agreement. He noted that this would assist the Township with moving forward to get a better rating than an Aa2 which is very hard to do.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Moody's did mention that the level of debt, on a per capita basis, is significantly higher than the average for across the country. He noted that the national average is \$1 per person and the Township's is about \$4 per person. Mr. Hawk noted that it is \$45 million minus the \$14 million that we already have on the books. Mr. Wolfe noted that we are about four times higher than the national average. He explained that he argued during the rating call that even though we have significant debt, the sewer user fee that guarantees most of the debt is reasonable, average, and below that compared to others in the area. He noted that this is a point of contention and is what will prevent the Township from becoming an Aa rating.

Mr. Crissman questioned for the date that the rating was provided, how does that compare with the date that Moody's issued a different bond rating for the City of Harrisburg, noting that they would have been considering both in the same time frame. Mr. Wolfe answered that he did not know. Mr. Crissman explained that Harrisburg's bond rating was increased. He questioned if there was any basis to their study to come up with the Township's rating process if they did the City's rating first. He noted that it might also have an impact on the next time the Township goes for a rating review. He noted if Moody's is stating that the economy is improving and they have increased the City of Harrisburg's rating, then they should improve ours as well. Mr. Crissman noted that it is a big issue that the Township needs to research. Mr. Wolfe suggested that the Township's rating was held after Harrisburg's rating process. Mr. Crissman noted that it may have worked to the Township's advantage.

Mr. Seeds noted that the reason the Township's rating was raised was that the surplus fund is back up to where it used to be.

Mr. Hawk noted that Moody's needed financial clarification on the financial aspect to eliminate the negative.

Mr. Wolfe noted that staff answered all of Moody's questions but their major concern is the overall amount of debt that the Township currently has and will have with this new issue. Mr. Crissman noted that they used the term, "volatile revenue stream," a couple of times in the report. Mr. Wolfe noted that they also stated that the Township has a strong tax base. He noted that he spoke to Mr. Wenger and Mr. Hewlett and they did not understand the statement as well. Mr. Seeds noted that they referred to the Township as being economically sensitive and volatile

but he suggested that everyone is. Mr. Wolfe noted that part of Moody's concern is that the Township only has two sources of tax revenues. Mr. Crissman agreed that they stated that in the report. Mr. Wolfe noted that we only have the Earned Income Tax (EIT) and Real Estate Tax, the only two significant sources of revenue to fund the budget.

Mr. Seeds questioned what Moody's meant when they stated that the tax basis was \$4.2 billion. Mr. Wolfe answered that it is the assessed value of the property in the Township. Mr. Seeds noted that the market value is listed at \$3,664,000,000. Mr. Wolfe noted that is the market value as compared to the Township's assessed value that is about \$4.2 billion. He noted that it is the assessed value of all property in the Township that we would apply our mileage rate to come up with a real estate tax. He noted that the market value is what you home sells for, and it is different.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the assessed value is a comparative figure of all properties based against them at a specific point in time in Dauphin County and for this County it is 2002.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Wolfe if he understood the key statistics. He questioned what the five-year dollar change is. He questioned if that has to do with the surplus. Mr. Wolfe answered yes as they did have some fund balance questions on an entry question that was clarified for Moody's; however, they were impressed with the fact that the Township has re-established its fund balance and are now in compliance with the policy that it has more than 25% of any year's operating expenses in reserve. Mr. Crissman questioned what would cause the adjustment. Mr. Hawk questioned what would cause them to put "volatile revenue" in the report. Mr. Wolfe answered that he had no idea. Mr. Houck suggested that since the Township has a lot of retail business in the Township, they may consider it to be volatile since stores are closing and opening, but for this Township, that is not the case. He noted that we have had more movement in than out over the past three years.

Mr. Seeds suggested that the Township is more secure as it has State Government as a local employer, many hospitals and medical facilities. He noted if those services went away we would have a real problem. Mr. Crissman noted that it does not make it unique to Lower Paxton Township, as every municipality has those same assets.

Mr. Hornung noted that one of the items that Moody's stated that could effect our future ratings was general fund assumption of Authority debt service. He questioned if the Authority had a general fund. Mr. Wolfe answered what they are saying in that statement is, should the

Authority in any fashion default, the Township is responsible for paying the debt. He noted that causes Moody's some concern. Mr. Hornung noted when we projected out the Authorities debt service it showed there were times when we were negative for that particular year. Mr. Wolfe answered that is not the issue. He noted that they are concerned about the Authority making its payments as the Township would be responsible for it, and now the Township is taking a huge debt load and it would cause a great increase in the real estate taxes. He noted that it is a stupid argument as the Authority would never stop charging its quarterly sewer rate and distribute that rate to the people who hold the debt.

Mr. Seeds questioned if .5% of the local income tax is from residents. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mr. Seeds questioned if non-residents pay 1% as the total tax is 2%. Mr. Houck explained, if you work in the Township but don't live in the Township you are assessed a non-residence tax. Mr. Seeds questioned if you pay 2%, with the School District getting the 1.5%. Mr. Houck explained that is the normal EIT where the Township gets .5% and the School District gets 1.5%. He explained that it adds up to 2%, but if they are a non-resident it is 1%. Mr. Wolfe noted that is only if their home municipality does not have an EIT. Mr. Seeds noted that they would pay 1% and we would get the entire 1%. Mr. Houck noted that the school district gets some of it. Mr. Seeds noted that some people pay 1% to the Township. Mr. Houck noted if their home municipality does not have one, then we get it, but if they do, we collect it and it is sent to the home municipality.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he also included the Preliminary Official Statement (POS). He noted that it is not in the final format because we have not issued the bonds yet. He explained that the final statement will fill in all the blanks for the bond issue including amounts, maturities, and interest rates at the time of sale. He noted that it describes the projects, sewer projects, stormwater projects and the public works building project, amount of money involved, and it describes the community and credit worthiness so perspective buyers of our debt have an understanding of who we are and why or why not they would buy our bonds. He noted, except for the numbers in regard to the bonds and the actual description of the projects, it is pretty much the same document that we have used for every issuance in the last five years.

Continued discussion regarding the debt service schedule for
the proposed issuance of General Obligation Bonds

Mr. Wolfe provided a memorandum and displayed the information from Mr. Hewlett, noting that a decision needs to be made so that the Board can issue debt in regard to the 2014 General Obligation Bond. He noted that the decision is in regards to the proposed \$7 million for Township projects and the debt service to be used for the \$7 million. He noted that the Board stated that it was going to issue \$3 million for continuation of stormwater improvements carrying the Township through until the end of 2017, with annual expenditures of \$1.2 million per year. He noted that staff would not start to spend those funds until 2015 as the Township is covered up to 2014 for capital stormwater improvements.

Mr. Wolfe noted that \$4 million is proposed to be borrowed for the rehabilitation and expansion of the Public Works building.

Mr. Wolfe noted during the last workshop session, Mr. Hewlett from Susquehanna Group Advisors made a presentation with three options in regard to the potential debt service schedules. He noted that Option One provides an annual debt service increase of \$500,000 through to 2027 increasing the current debt service of \$850,000 to \$1.3 million. He noted that it falls back to \$500,000 per year to 2034. He noted that the current Township Debt Service is \$850,000 a year and that is good through to 2027. He noted that this proposal front-ends the debt service in cooperation with what we currently have with the other two proposals tacking more of the debt service on to the end of the borrowing thus decreasing the annual impact on debt service in any fiscal year but extending the debt out and increasing costs to borrow. He noted that the total cost to borrow (interest) would be \$2.8 million and the impact on the real estate tax would be a 15% increase through to 2027; after which it would roll back because the debt would have been significantly reduced. He noted that the 15% increase would be a .206 mill increase, noting that we are currently at 1.3 mills, taking the new total to 1.5 mills.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Option Two, which is the most expensive in total dollars spent; however, the impact in any one year is less, takes the new debt service from \$500,000 down to \$280,000 but the Township will spend \$1.125 million every year through 2034. He noted that the increase in annual tax to pay the debt would be 9.2% increase or .12 mills going from 1.3 mills to 1.42 mills. He noted, in the end, the interest would be \$4.6 million.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Option Three is a hybrid of one and two, having an annual interest for debt service of \$400,000 through 2027, after which it increases to \$800,000 through to 2034. He noted that it requires a 13% increase in real estate tax going from 1.3 mills to 1.47 mills with a total spend for interest of \$3.6 million.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Board needs to choose an option so that it can be in a position to issue debt. He noted that the financial advisors can't move forward until a decision is made.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned for Option One what would the increase be on a resident who owns a home that is assessed at \$200,000. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would have to figure that out. He noted that a 15% increase for a home valued at \$200,000 would increase the Township's portion from \$864 to \$950. He noted that the total real estate taxes for a house assessed at \$200,000, a person pays \$188.20 and a 15% increase on that would be \$25. He noted that it would be under \$900. Mr. Crissman noted the cost for all three options would provide the Board what the impact would be for the taxpayers. He noted if they would be paying \$260, a 15% increase would be roughly \$39 more. Mrs. Lindsey noted that Option One had an interest charge of \$2.8 million, but Option Two would have \$4.6 million.

Mr. Wolfe noted if we look at how it will effect us in the near term or through the light of the borrowing, for Option One in 2027, you lose the \$850,000 existing debt portion of the debt service. Mr. Crissman questioned if we would need to borrow before 2027, and if we borrow again before that date, we would be assessing the people a \$39 increase now, but what would be the increase on top of that to offset the debt service based on the new borrowing. Mr. Wolfe answered that you would have the ability to add the new borrowing at the end. He noted that we have the high, the low and the modified in Option Three. Mr. Crissman noted that we have to think to the future for when we will borrow again and what will that debt service impact have on the tax payers. He noted that Option One would provide for a \$39 increase now and will do the same in two or three years. Mr. Wolfe noted that this is part of the strategic plan that we will be working on this evening. Mr. Crissman noted that Option Two will have the least impact on the taxpayers, with a higher interest rate over a longer period of time but if you borrow in the future it would have less impact on the people as it would be less of an increase. He noted that Option Three is a modification of both options one and two.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that \$39 is a little over three dollars a month.

Mr. Houck noted Options Two and Three provides for paying more interest down the road.

Mr. Hawk noted that he was originally thinking in terms of Option One but he has shifted his thinking due to the impact on the taxpayers. Mr. Crissman noted that is what it comes down to. He noted that he liken the bond issue to when you buy a house you get a low payment and then you have a balloon payment at the end, so you get hit harder at the end. He noted that you don't know what your financial picture will be 20 years down the road. Mr. Houck noted that most people take a straight line mortgage. He noted that the long term effect will be with Options Two and Three since you are paying more interest as it will be less now but more later. Mr. Crissman noted that the municipality would be paying more interest, but the taxpayer who is paying the dollars does not see that, they only see what they are paying in their annual fees. Mr. Houck noted that the Board needs to lay it out to the taxpayers for how much they will be paying but saving on interest in the long term. Mr. Hawk noted that they only see their tax bill.

Mr. Seeds noted that later on this evening, we will discuss stormsewer work and how we are going to handle that, but Moody's did not see the Township needing money in the future or anything other than stormsewer. He noted that we should be a in good shape with the new roof as this building is in good shape and it is large enough. He noted if we add on to public works that will be large enough. He noted that Moody's did not see any major expenses in the next 13 years other than stormsewer. He noted if we get more liquid fuels we can do more with the roads, but the stormsewer is the only thing that he can see that will need more funding.

Mr. Wolfe explained that we are looking at a strategic plan this evening and each one of those items cost money. He noted that staff has put together a list of close to 30 items on it and each one will cost something. He noted to say that the costs of government will not increase if we can continue with what we have started this evening is not correct. Mr. Seeds noted that a decision may be made to form a stormsewer authority depending if we fix the stormsewer using the tax base or some other formula. He noted that would have a big impact when that decision is made as it could be an authority bill or part of the sewer authority bill, so the Board would not need to look at borrowing for the Township, but under another authority. Mr. Wolfe noted as Moody's has pointed out, they are looking at us in total and for what the citizens can bear, whether it is an Authority customer or sanitary or stormwater authority or taxpayers, they are looking at what the citizens in total can bear.

Mr. Crissman noted that it would cost \$39 for Option One, but questioned what it would be for Options Two and Three. Mr. Wolfe answered for Option Two it would be roughly \$25 and for Option Three it would be \$33 on an assessment of \$200,000.

Mr. Hornung noted that the answer to what Mr. Wolfe wants may require the Board to go through the strategic planning process. Mr. Wolfe noted that the process is not a one-night process; it will take a full quarter of the year to complete. He noted that the list items have unknown costs at this time and you don't put costs numbers on them until you know they are part of the plan. He noted that we are not at a point to know how it will impact and we have a borrowing that we want to entertain now. He questioned should we delay the borrowing based upon doing the plan or do you make an educated guess knowing that the average impact to the taxpayer is between \$25 and \$39 a year.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned when the last time the taxes were raised. Mr. Wolfe answered that it was two years ago. Mr. Houck suggested that it was roughly \$35 for a house assessed at \$200,000. Mr. Wolfe noted that it was a significant increase since the taxes were so low.

Mr. Weaver noted that the safest option is Option Three if you don't know what you will be doing. He noted that the Authority has a clearer picture but Option Three is a safe bet as it is a modified borrowing. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is the middle ground between the three options.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned Mr. Houck what he thinks. Mr. Houck answered that he would rather pay less interest now because you are in the position where you will make money off the investments. He noted you are paying less now and that is what taxpayers like. He noted the taxpayers will bear the cost of interest and end up paying for it eventually. He noted that the challenge is to communicate that to them. Mr. Crissman noted that the average citizen does not care that he will have to pay for that ten or twenty years from now, all he cares about is the bill that comes to his front door. He noted that we will hear from the senior citizens who are on fixed incomes and how we are attaching another \$39 to their bill and that they only have social security. Mr. Houck noted if you look at it that way then Option Three is your best bet. Mr. Crissman noted that the other side is that the dollars that you will be paying later are going to be cheaper dollars, not today's dollars if the economy gets better. Mr. Houck noted that Option Three is only \$6 less than Option One. Mr. Crissman suggested that Option Three is a good compromise.

Mr. Crissman noted that the big question is how soon we will have to borrow again. Mr. Hornung noted if you believe that we will have to borrow again then we should take Option One. Mr. Crissman agreed that he would go with Option One. He noted if we knew that we would not have to borrow he would go with Option One. Mr. Hornung noted if we know we will have to borrow, which we probably will, he would go with Option One because if we borrow we will use the wrap and throw the payments on the end. He noted rather than throw the payments on the end now, we should take Option One and if you have to end up doing the wrap for the next borrowing that would throw it out to the end of this debt. Mr. Hawk noted that it will hit the taxpayer the hardest. Mr. Hornung noted if you do the wrap you are already pushing the debt service out and if you come back to borrow again, what will you do, tack it on to the end of that. He noted that is way out there. Mr. Hawk noted that he is hung up on the \$39. Mr. Hornung noted that many people will be hung up on the \$39 but it is a case of pay me now or pay me later. He questioned if an \$8 or \$6 difference make that big a difference to the people. He noted that they will complain whether it is \$39 or \$33 noting that studies show that \$29 is a heck of a lot cheaper than \$30, noting that it is not a dollar cheaper it is ten dollars cheaper. He noted that \$33 and \$39 are the same. He noted if we need to borrow money in the future and if the money is cheaper you would throw it on the end and that is what we are doing now, it would not allow the option to do it later and then what are you going to do.

Mr. Weaver noted that you could have a larger increase later. Mr. Hawk noted that he does not like that \$1.1 debt service. Mr. Hornung noted that we could raise the taxes \$39 and do Option 3 knowing that you will borrow and start saving the money. He noted that we have done this in the past to prevent large tax increases down the road. Mr. Hawk noted that Option Three provides for a reasonable level debt service.

Mr. Hornung noted that we should get to the point where we stop borrowing and start using money that comes in to pay for our projects as there is a cost associated with borrowing and that is the interest rate. He noted that we need to raise the taxes up to the level of the spending required to do the projects out of pocket like you would do at home. He noted that we need to stop borrowing.

Mr. Crissman questioned if anyone was in favor of Option Two. No response was heard. Mr. Crissman noted that we are down to Option One and Three. Mr. Hawk noted that he likes what Mr. Hornung stated about Option One but he is leaning towards Option Three. Mrs.

Lindsey questioned if it is due to the \$6 difference in payments. Mr. Hawk noted that you would increase it \$6 or \$9.

Mr. Crissman questioned what the current tax payment is. Mr. Wolfe answered that it is \$260.

Mr. Hawk noted that he is leaning towards Option Three but would not be disappointed if the Board chooses Option One. Mr. Crissman noted in 2017, the payment drops from \$1.2 to \$797,000. He noted that the drop is the same time period for Option One, however, it drops to \$501,000 and for Option Three it is \$797,000. Mr. Houck noted that one drops \$840,000 and the other drops \$430,000.

Mrs. Lindsey noted that you have to have money to do as the Slogan says, Good Government for a Great Community. Mr. Crissman noted that is true but you can't kill the citizen doing it. Mrs. Lindsey noted that \$39 is not a lot of money. Mr. Crissman noted that it is not a lot for those who are working, but what about the seniors. Mrs. Lindsey noted that it is only \$3 a month. Mr. Crissman stated that he does not disagree with it but Mrs. Lindsey can talk to the seniors about it. Mr. Crissman noted that it also impacts the young families as well.

Mr. Seeds noted that you are paying a lot more interest under Option Three, noting that it is over \$3 million. Mr. Crissman noted that he supports saving the money one hundred percent but the taxpayer could care less about it, as all they care about is what is on the bill that comes to the door. Mr. Crissman noted that our part is to educate them. Mr. Hornung noted that it is our part to be fiduciary responsible. Mr. Crissman agreed.

Mr. Houck noted if people live to 2028, then the bill will be that much higher. Mr. Crissman noted that we should bite the bullet and go with Option One. Mr. Hawk noted that it would be \$3.25 more a month to put away for Option One. Mr. Crissman noted if we choose Option One we need to educate the community. Mr. Seeds noted that he is for Option One. Mrs. Lindsey noted that she is also for Option One. Mr. Hawk noted that he was originally for Option One. Mr. Wolfe noted that Option One it is. He explained that he will talk to the financial people and let them know what option was chosen and they will let us know when they plan to issue the bonds. He suggested that it will be next week and he will project the sale live in this room for anyone who wants to view it.

Review of the Township's Vision, Mission Statement and Slogan

Mr. Wolfe noted that when the Board first began its strategic plan several years ago, it prepared a Vision and Mission Statements and Slogan. He suggested, before embarking on the Phase 2 Strategic Plan, it would be a good idea to review these items. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Vision that was prepared by the Board and staff in 2005 is "Lower Paxton Township will be an open, vibrant, and progressive municipality working within the bounds of available resources, providing the best quality of life for a growing community to be a recognized leader in central Pennsylvania." Mr. Wolfe noted that the Mission is "To achieve our vision Lower Paxton Township will work to meet and exceed the needs of a growing Township in a cost efficient manner." He noted that the Slogan is "Good government for a great community."

Mr. Hornung noted that a customer came into his business yesterday and told him that Lower Paxton Township is the best place to live and he loves it and he asked him to communicate that to the other Board members.

Mr. Crissman questioned if two minor changes could be made. He noted in the Vision Statement, the last full sentence should read; "quality of life for a growing community *and* to be a recognized leader. He noted for the Mission Statement there should be a coma after the word vision. He noted that we are doing two things, providing a quality of life for a growing community and to be a recognized leader. Mr. Wolfe noted if we made changes to the Vision or Mission Statement the Board will have to re-adopt the resolution. Mrs. Lindsey suggested that it was fine the way it was.

Mr. Seeds questioned Mr. Wolfe if any of these statements need to be changed. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Board should review it before it embarks on Phase 2 of it new plan. He noted that he is not saying that it needs to be changed; rather questioned if it should be change in light of the Board undertaking Phase 2 the strategic plan..

Mr. Hawk noted that he would suggest changing the first word of the slogan from good to responsible. He noted that this was Mr. Hornung's slogan. Mr. Hornung noted that he is fine if it is changed. Mr. Wolfe noted that he likes the current slogan for how it rolls off your tongue. Mr. Wolfe questioned if the Board wanted to change the slogan warning as it is already printed on all the letterhead; whereas the other statements are not in print except for the webpage and TV Channel. Mr. Hawk noted, in that case, just leave it the way it is.

Mr. Wolfe noted when the Board and staff does the brainstorming to develop a strategic plan we should do it with our Vision, Mission and Slogan in mind.

Strategic Planning Session: Step 1 – Brainstorming

Mr. Wolfe noted that he went back to how the Board structured the first strategic plan and he put this together in a relatively similar fashion with some minor amendments given where we are today. He explained that he met with the Department Directors to prepare for this, and their suggestions are found on the note pads posted on the walls. He noted that there are some parameters, noting that the items to include in the discussions should be for new and one time expenditures. He noted that we are not talking about ongoing expenditures for operations. He noted that items to include should also have a cost of \$25,000 or more; if it costs less than that it should be absorbed in the operating budget. He noted when the first strategic plan was prepared ten years ago, the threshold was \$5,000. He noted that we are not talking about the Authority or the Friendship Center; rather the General Fund and the Township's Operations. He noted that there is a strategic plan for the Authority and a capital plan for the FC. He noted that the General Fund is lacking the most in long-term planning.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Luetchford is present to lead the discussion for Parks and Recreation which is an integral part of the General Fund and Mr. Weaver is also present to provide input.

Mr. Wolfe noted that staff has prepared a listing which he will go through quickly to start the discussions; noting that the discussions should be the big picture level, 30,000 foot level, noting that we are not here tonight, in his estimation, to discuss the particulars or cost items or how to implement them. He noted that those discussions will come later as we prepare the plan and investigate the items we decide to include in the plan. He noted that tonight we will list the items the Board wants to work on over the next three to five years and which are the most important.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Public Works list includes: Stormwater Improvements from the General Fund or an Authority; Public Works Building Improvement Program; Two additional laborers; a Public Works Operations Supervisor; Implementing ADA Improvements; and Implementing the MS4 Program. He noted for Transportation the list includes: Jonestown Road Bridge; Red Top Road Bridge; Nyes Road/Devonshire Heights Road Intersection; Colonial

Road-Devonshire/Crums and Valley Road intersection; and Spring Creek Road solution. He noted that Public Works has two tablets, one for Operations and one for Transportation. Mr. Wolfe questioned if Mr. Robbins had anything to add to the lists. Mr. Robbins answered that the ADA improvements are not just for curb cuts but also within the park facilities. Mr. Wolfe noted that this should be added to the Parks and Recreation list. Mr. Robbins noted that it will tie into the stormwater list. Mr. Seeds questioned if he could add some items to the list. Mr. Wolfe noted that we should do it now. Mr. Seeds noted that Nyes and Jonestown Road traffic intersection needs an arrow and turn lane, and he would like improvements to the North Mountain Road and Blue Ridge Avenue Intersection. He noted that he would like to see Hickory and Blackberry Alleys paved in Linglestown.

Mr. Crissman questioned what about the I-83 improvements. Mr. Wolfe suggested that we don't include the interstates improvements as we won't pay for them and won't have any control in the projects. He noted that he would provide an update at the workshop session for the I-83 expansion project. Mr. Crissman noted that the major intersection for accidents is Union Deposit and I-83 and the Board reviewed the diverging diamond that was presented by HRG. He noted that he did not know if PennDOT would follow through on those items or not. Mr. Robbins noted that there would be no Township expenditures for those projects.

Mr. Seeds questioned if Franklin Street would be included in this list. Mr. Wolfe answered if the Board chooses to do something more expansive noting that what we are planning to do would be less than \$25,000 for this year's budget.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned what a Public Works Operations Supervisor would do. Mr. Robbins answered that it would be a position similar to Jim Wetzel's in the Authority. He noted that now he depends on Jeff Kline, who is a foreman, and Matt Miller who is the Engineering Field Technician, who handles complaints and the MS4 program.

Mr. Wolfe noted for the number of people working in the Public Works Department, it has the lowest percentage of management personnel and there is the need for additional management oversight.

Mr. Robbins noted that he needs funds for additional paving dollars. Mr. Seeds questioned when the increased Liquid Fuels Funds would be available as it would be a huge help for paving. Mr. Robbins explained that it will be a help, coming in at \$1.8 million. Mr. Seeds noted that it would take another three to four years to reach that level of funding.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the alleys in Linglestown are used much. Mr. Seeds answered yes. He noted that we tried to pave Blackberry Alley before during the road project. Mr. Wolfe noted that the west side of the alley was paved but not the east side. Mr. Seeds noted that all the other alleys except for those two are paved. Mr. Weaver noted that the Authority is getting ready to pave a portion of Blackberry Alley behind Leo's Pizza. Mr. Wolfe noted that we can remove Blackberry Alley from the list. Mr. Weaver noted that he will not pave the entire alley; the area about 125 from Eric Kessler's property. He noted that he can only pave where the sewer line runs. Mr. Seeds noted that the Township never accepted that portion of the alley. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Authority had the right to restore it.

Mr. Wolfe noted that moving on to the Police Department, the list includes: four additional police officers; noting that we had a high of 62 officers with the Department being approved to have 63 officers. He noted that currently there are 53 officers which does not include the PSD. He noted that we are very lean with police officers in the field and if we are going to look towards the future we should plan for four additional police officers. Mr. Wolfe noted that the other items are K-9 services that we don't have and borrow services from other municipalities. PSD Johnson noted that he has had discussions with Supervisor Lindsey in regards to this. He noted that a presentation will be made to the Board during its next Workshop session. Mr. Seeds questioned PSD Johnson if he is in favor of this. PSD Johnson answered yes. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is a cost, noting that staff is in favor of all the items on the list. Mrs. Lindsey noted that it is a cost for the canine but in checking with other departments, some of them had community fund raisers to help defray the cost. She noted that she has a power point presentation for the next meeting. Mr. Hawk noted that it also includes the cost of the officer to take care of the dog as well on a regular basis. He noted that it is a major cost. PSD Johnson noted that he would need to replace the canine officer with another officer. Mr. Hawk questioned if the canine officer would be one of the four additional officers. Mr. Wolfe answered no. Mr. Seeds noted that it would be an additional officer and make the total five officers. PSD Johnson noted that he can't count a canine officer as manpower and the reason is that they are required to work a shortened shift due to the requirement of taking care of the animal when they are not on duty as case law states that the Township would have to compensate the officer for the care at home during off time and vacation time. He noted that typically the officer is permitted to leave one hour early only working seven hours or if he works a 12 hour shift he would only work 11

hours. He noted that it would impact the minimum manpower requirements. Mr. Wolfe noted that we would need four additional police officers and if you have a canine, it would be a fifth police officer. Mrs. Lindsey noted that we are constantly borrowing a canine dog, noting that we have borrowed a dog four times since January. She noted that it does not include the times when we needed a canine and there were none available. She noted that the other communities are paying for these dogs that we borrow. Mr. Hawk suggested that you are looking at \$30,000 to \$40,000. Mr. Johnson noted for the dog and training, it would be between \$16,000 and \$18,000 for the dog, training and equipment to go with the dog in addition to the salary for an additional police officer, and he would need a car as well, using an older patrol supervisors' SUV. Mr. Wolfe noted that a more detailed presentation would be made at the next workshop session.

PSD Johnson noted that equipping police officers with tazers is on the list but he is not in favor of this. He noted that the majority of patrol supervisors are not for tazers and an overwhelming number of officers are not in favor of using tazers. He noted it is due to the liability that goes with the use of the tazers and adding additional equipment to a belt that is already loaded down with equipment. He noted that they believe that the money could be spent better on something else. He noted that it would cost over \$50,000 to outfit the entire Department for patrol. He noted that it includes initial training, the cost of tazers, and the cartridges used for training as it would cost roughly \$1,000 per officer. Mr. Seeds questioned if every police officer would get one. PSD Johnson answered that some departments only have so many per shift and the officer has to sign them in and out and then they get locked in the lockers and the next officer doesn't have one to use. He noted that they can be damaged more when being traded off from one officer to another and then there is the question of who is responsible for the damage. He noted that we went through this with the portable radios as we would have \$5,000 radios that were damaged and no one owns up to it. He noted that each officer is assigned his own radio and responsible for it.

Mr. Seeds noted that a few years ago PSD Johnson was against tazers. PSD Johnson answered that he is personally against handing out tazers to every officer as there has been some recent court decisions, the latest catch phrase for tazers is "Lawful but awful". He noted that officers are using tazers, complaints are being filed, investigations are being conducted by the Departments clearing the officer of any policy violations, but yet still having to pay out in civil suits because the citizen was injured and there were other options. He noted if someone won't

come out of a car, they taze them to get them out. He noted if someone is hiding under a table, they taze them, noting that the tazer prevents officers from going hands on which is something police officers have to do. He noted that he is not for handing them out. Mr. Wolfe noted that this is a brainstorming session. Mr. Seeds questioned if the City of Harrisburg has tazers. PSD Johnson answered that he did not know, but Susquehanna Township has them. Mr. Seeds noted that Penbrook has the tazers. He noted that his son-in-law likes it.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the Department has one. PSD Johnson answered that we have one tazer. He noted that he asked for some data to argue for or against tazers for any incident that has occurred over the past five years where a tazer would have made a difference in the safety of a citizen or the officer and he has not been able to produce such information. He noted that officers are faced with working with mentally ill people, drug addicts, and sometimes the officer may need to take an extra 30 minutes to talk the person down as opposed to ending it quickly by using a tazer. He noted that a town in Vermont paid out \$250,000 in civil suits as a result of a use of a tazer in which the investigation determined that the use of the tazer was lawful but it still paid that amount of money. Mr. Hawk noted that he would rather use available money for the other things on the list as opposed to tazers. Mr. Seeds questioned if you could put a dollar amount for tazers. Mr. Crissman noted that we are not there yet; we are just brainstorming ideas to add items to the list. PSD Johnson noted that the cost would be about \$50,000. He noted that the insurance company questioned if we issued tazers to the officers and he responded no and the insurance person's response was good.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the officers would need to be certified to carry them. PSD Johnson answered yes. Mrs. Lindsey noted that it would be a cost too.

Mr. Crissman questioned the software in the vehicles for record keeping. He questioned if they were up to date in all the vehicles. PSD Johnson explained that we have a new records management system, and at this time, we use laptops in the cars requiring special mounts but it does not allow for a second person to sit in the front of the vehicle due to the air bags. He noted that he had an individual from the Rotary Club ride along but it was in an older car and when we get rid of that car we will have no cars that will allow for a passenger in the front seat. He noted that we can't disable the air bag and if it deploys the computer equipment will become a projectile in the car. He noted that he is looking to move from the laptop to a tablet for each officer. He added that to the list. Mr. Seeds questioned if the air bag would destroy the

equipment. PSD Johnson answered yes. Mr. Seeds questioned if we could remove the air bag. PSD Johnson answered no.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the in-car video that is on the list is something different. PSD Johnson noted that the Township received a \$100,000 grant to replace the existing in-car videos. He noted that the 2000 model failed and had to be replaced. He noted that the Department went for about 15 months with no in-car video cameras as he did not have the money to replace them. He noted that they are very important for the safety of the police officer and the citizens. Mr. Wolfe noted that during the next five years the equipment will need to be replaced.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the tablet would be mounted on a pedestal. PSD Johnson answered that it would be a hand held tablet that they could take with them on a call. He noted that they make mounts that the tablet could be mounted to and be easily removed. He noted that the other option would be to go with the touch books and the dash centered mounted computers which are \$7,000 to \$8,000 per car.

Mr. Hornung noted that the preliminary outline was for one-time projects with no operating increases but many of these include adding additional personnel. He questioned if it would be a continuous cost. Mr. Wolfe answered that it is not a current operation as he is looking for anything that is included in the plan that would be added to the current bottom line as a one-time expenditure or annual expenditure. He noted that the cost of additional personnel would be around \$100,000. He noted that it would increase the budget moving forward. He noted that most of the capital fund money comes from the General Fund.

Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the 53 officers includes the two officers that are in the Police Academy now. PSD Johnson answered yes and noted that they are doing well. Mrs. Lindsey noted that they will graduate June. She suggested that the Board members should attend the graduation at the Dauphin County Technical School. She noted that it is a long time since we had someone in the Police Academy. PSD Johnson stated that he would let the Board know when the event will take place.

PSD Johnson noted that he has two officers on extended sick leave due to injuries or illness and he had to move a warrant officer and detective to patrol as that is his priority service. He noted at one point he had three officers out of service with one officer attending the FBI National Academy.

Mr. Hornung questioned if the Department has anyone on the task force. PSD Johnson answered that he has one person assigned full time to the Dauphin County Drug Task Force, four people assigned to the Dauphin County Crises Response Team, an officer on the Accident Reconstruction Team, an officer on the Evidence Forensic Team, and the warrant officer is assigned to the US Marshalls Task Force. He noted for any Dauphin County related agency that exists, the Department has someone assigned to it.

Mr. Hornung questioned if someone is working with sexual solicitation on-line. PSD Johnson answered that a detective is assigned to that Pennsylvania State Police Task Force involved with computer crimes and child pornography.

Mr. Wolfe noted the Mr. Luetchford's Parks and Recreation Department list includes: Wolfersberger Tract with a fill site development plan and a park development plan noting that it is operating now as a paintball site. He noted that the dog park people would like to get in and develop another park as soon as the land is leveled and grass is planted. He noted that the Heroes Grove Project is having a ground breaking July 5th, noting that they will want to start placing fill at that site, suggesting that it will be complete and operational within two years. He noted that we need to finish George Park, at a cost of \$1.5 million to include ball courts, Skate Park and over a mile of trails. He noted that we need to implement the Greenway Plan that was completed four years ago, noting it is one of the most important items from the Comprehensive Plan from the public. He noted that Nyes Road is one location as well as Darlington Trail which are projects that will need to be funded. He noted that last on the list is the replacement of existing park equipment and facilities. He noted that Brightbill, Koons, and Kohl Parks have aging facilities, to include tennis courts, parking lots, and lighting systems that have been around for many decades. He noted that we added the ADA improvements that are needed in the parks and, lastly, he noted that he has been in discussion with a group to acquire Mateer Field. He noted that they are looking to transfer the four-acre park to the Township. He noted that redevelopment of that area would need to be funded as well.

Mr. Seeds questioned what the status for that acquisition is. Mr. Luetchford answered that there is ongoing discussion for Mateer Field. Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the parking lot would be a part of that. Mr. Luetchford answered yes.

Mr. Luetchford noted that park equipment and large scale buildings, parking lots and lighting systems are part of the significant amount of work that is needed to be completed in the

parks. Mrs. Lindsey questioned how the upkeep is going for Possibility Place. Mr. Luetchford answered that his staff addressed the immediate needs that are safety issues. Mr. Crissman questioned if there is an active committee. Mr. Luetchford answered only one member.

Mr. Robbins noted that his people in the parks are telling him that the facilities are aging and need to be rehabilitated, to include mending fences, backstops and the like. Mr. Luetchford noted that there are needs for more storage facilities.

Mr. Crissman suggested that another dog park should go on that list. Mr. Luetchford noted that it is included in the Wolfersberger Tract. He noted that we have discussed the need for artificial turf at the current park as we are unable to keep grass in the park area. Mr. Crissman noted that you need to rest the fields but the dogs need somewhere else to go.

Mr. Luetchford noted for a Nyes Run Greenway, there is a need to breaching the stream, so it would necessitate building a \$100,000 bridge. He noted that you are talking about a significant expense.

Mr. Crissman questioned if the park equipment is all inclusive in terms of fencing etc. Mr. Luetchford answered yes to include swings etc.

Mr. Wolfe noted if we move on to Administration, there are four items on that list to include: the enhanced use of the PEG TV Channel noting that we have a Comcast and Verizon channel that we use to televise Board meetings but there is a significant amount of hours where we just run the bulletin board. He noted that we need a better facility to broadcast and people to do it. He noted that there is a potential to partner with the schools to help us put together programming but we would need a more elaborate studio. He noted that social media and resident contact is something that is very trendy in municipal government today. He noted that a reserve 911 system is when the Township makes robocalls to the residents with matters of public safety or advertisement. He noted that it is more affordable these days and many municipalities have bought into the reverse 911 for public safety. He noted that 311 is for social media information and also Facebook and Twitter. He stated that he is not suggesting that we do this; he is only putting it on the list. He noted that the investment in IT, noting that the Board has met with people from Appalachia, that there are technology issues and there is far more that we could do if we had better utilization of information technology. Mrs. Lindsey questioned if that would include the off site facilities. Mr. Wolfe answered that it would include the entire information network to include hardware, software and how you implement it and manage it.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he included a succession plan due to pending retirements. He explained, for management personnel, in terms of this strategic plan, 37% of the management employees will be eligible for retirement and 40% of the clerks and custodians. He noted for the Public Works employees 30% will be eligible to retire. He suggested that we should build a succession plan to prepare for when this starts to occur. Mrs. Lindsey questioned if the early retirement is a good idea. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mrs. Lindsey asked him about the potential for offering an early retirement but it would be separate from the succession plan. He noted that he would add it to the list for non-uniform employees. Mrs. Lindsey questioned when it was done in the past, three people took it, was it due to down sizing. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mrs. Lindsey noted that many employees are 57 or 58 years old and have been with the Township for a long time and some may retire. She noted that they no longer contribute to the pension and if we hire new people at a lower rate we would not be paying as much, and they would be paying into the pension plan. She noted if those employees continue to work an extra three years, the pension fund would increase. Mr. Houck noted that some people who have worked for 30 or 35 years would like to get more credit for their pensions. Mr. Wolfe noted that issue is a collective bargaining issue. He noted that the union bargained in reverse and requested that they stop paying into retirement at a specific point in time which is 27 years. He noted that the other issue that is somewhat of a fallacy. He noted if you take a senior secretary who retired today, you will not replace her with a secretary at entry level and have a large difference in compensation. He noted that there will be bumping involved and the senior secretary is going to be replaced by another senior secretary or clerk who moves up with the difference in compensation not being top to bottom but top to a lesser top. He noted that we will bump through the system and typically this happens. He noted it occurred recently in the Police Department and five bumps were involved. He noted that one retirement caused five movements noting that the person who took the open job is already at the highest level and the person who came in at the bottom replaced someone that was at the bottom level. Mr. Crissman noted that there is some savings but not a huge savings. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is not the same for the administrative employees' as the Board sets the compensation for them and you don't have a bumping system. He noted, most likely, you don't have people waiting in the wings to move up producing five bumps for one retirement. He noted for most management positions you will have to hire from the outside. Mr. Crissman noted that management positions are not controlled by contracts.

Mr. Hogentogler noted that one benefit would be pension payments made by the newer employees, and for benefits you may hire a new employee who is single and not married.

Mr. Robbins noted that there are two people in the Public Works Department that have combined years of 65 to 70 years of experience and you can't replace what they provide. He noted that there needs to be some type of planning put into that process to be careful for how you do that as you don't want those people leaving as it would be very difficult to bring someone through the ranks and expect them to do what someone who has 35 years of experience to do. Mr. Wolfe noted that he has a concern as we need a succession plan. He noted that we have had some retirements over the past few years, but you never had a mass exodus as there are a significant number of people, many who are in this room, who are in their late fifties and will be coming up to normal retirement age soon. He noted that they may not all leave at normal retirement age but you will see retirements and it will be effecting the work force. He suggested that we need to plan for it.

Mr. Hogentogler noted that for any new employee, the hiring process takes time. He noted that it would take more time to hire a management person over an entry level laborer. He noted that a large percentage of the workforce will be able to retire in the next couple of years. Mr. Wolfe noted that this is a five-year time frame. He noted that we can't ignore the issues.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would like to add the re-codification of ordinances as this has not been done in over ten years.

Mr. Wolfe noted that for Community Development there is a need to update the Comprehensive Plan every ten years, and it was last done in 2003. He noted that we will need one more Codes Enforcement the work is too much for two employees to handle.

Mr. Hornung questioned how the Township's web site is. Mr. Wolfe noted that it is okay. He stated that there is more that we could do with it but as far as information services it is 90% up to date. He noted that it is a huge website. Mrs. Lindsey noted that Mr. Wolfe just added the information in regards to the drug box that is located in the Police Department.

Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be nice to be able to pay bills on line or by credit card, not just the sewer bills. He noted the IT perspective is good, but there is more that we could tie into it. He noted that the TV provider has a service that once you tape the meeting you could broadcast it on TV and on the website. He noted that the meeting would be available anytime a

person wants to watch it. He noted that staff tries to direct people to the website as much as possible.

Mr. Wolfe noted for the Fire Department the two issues are a Fire Services Study and the Fire Equipment Capital Plan Phase IV. PSD Johnson noted that he has met with the fire chiefs and assistant fire chiefs and they all agreed that there is redundant apparatus in the Township and each one was willing to relinquish a piece of equipment. He noted that we are trying to work out the details for how many trucks and ladder trucks are needed. He noted that they have agreed that they can push back some of the purchases that are scheduled. He noted that we will meet again to include the fire marshal to iron out the details.

PSD Johnson explained that he has a close friend who recently retired from the Washington, D.C. Fire Department as their number two person. He was a deputy fire chief and has many degrees from the University of Maryland and Fire Services and has told him that he would be willing to provide his view of what the Township should be doing. Mr. Crissman questioned if it would be pro bono. PSD Johnson answered yes.

PSD Johnson noted that the Police Department participated this past weekend in the DEA Drug Take Back Program and from what they received and the past collections, they turned over a ¼ ton to the DEA for destruction. He noted that it is a very busy place in the Department.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he views these sheets as the initial list and if anything needs to be added this would be a good time to do this. He noted that he would like to rank the items by order of importance with a five being the highest number and a one the lowest. He noted that you may run out of numbers or may not use all the numbers. He noted if you run out you are done and if you don't use them all you cannot share the remaining numbers with anyone else. He noted if something is not important to a rater, it should not get a number. He noted that we are attempting to build a list of activities that are important to us for the next five years. He noted those things that are not rated highly will be kept on a list, and if needed will be moved up the list. He noted that it will be a continual revisiting process. He noted once the ranking is completed tonight, the information will be compiled and we will discuss the results in about two months, and re-rank the list again.

Mr. Seeds noted that we have to go around in each category and choose the top one and use the number five. Mr. Wolfe answered that was correct but you may not use any five's in a particular category.

Mr. Hornung noted that he would like to see each Department Head do his ranking for his Department first before he does his ranking. Mr. Wolfe noted that staff can do the ranking first. Mr. Hornung noted that he wants to see how Mr. Luetchford ranks his Department. Mr. Crissman suggested that each Department head will put all five in their Departments. He noted if they do their ranking with the Board's ranking it will skew the results. Mr. Seeds suggested that they won't put fives in all of their categories. Mr. Crissman noted if he was a Department head he would do that. Mrs. Lindsey noted that they may not put fives under all their items in their Department.

Mr. Wolfe suggested that the Board members will put their numbers on the right side and staff will put their numbers on the left side. Mr. Hornung questioned that it would not answer for him how a Department Head wants to rank his items in his area. Mr. Crissman noted that he agrees that he would like to know how they would rank them. Mr. Hornung noted at some point a Department head has to look at all the sheets to do his ranking. Mr. Crissman noted that he wants to be able to interface with staff to know what their priorities are. Mr. Hornung noted if a Department head puts fives after all his items he will not know what the most important item on the list is.

Mr. Luetchford noted that the public wants the Greenways, we have to take care of what we have, and we have to finish George Park. PSD Johnson noted that his top three are hiring more officers, canine, and in car video. Mr. Robbins noted that stormwater is number one, followed by the public works building improvements and operations supervisor. Mr. Wolfe noted for transportation it would be up to the Board to rank those items. Mr. Wolfe noted for administration it would be investment in IT, followed by PEG Channel TV and the succession. Mr. Houck suggested that the succession plan be move to the second spot. Mr. Wolfe noted that Community Development and Fire Services only have two items listed.

At this time both staff and Board members placed their numbers on the lists.

Mr. Wolfe noted since all the numbers have been placed on the lists, staff will prepare the ranking with the initial numbers. He noted that he will get the information out to the Board, asking for additional information or questions from the Board and in the next couple of weeks place a dollar amount behind each one. He noted that he would bring it back in four to six weeks to finalize the list to make sure it meets the Board's approval and then we will do another rating after the Board has a chance to review the list.

Action to authorize the procurement of Microsoft Office 365 for all Township computers

Mr. Wolfe noted that given the amount for this purchase he wanted to bring this to the Board of Supervisors for approval. He noted the Board approved the lease of 64 computers and two lap tops; however they do not come with an operating system. He noted that there are two choices for operating systems; a stand alone in the computer similar to what you have in the laptops or Microsoft 365 which is a cloud based system. He noted that the system is located in the Cloud and all the documents are in the Cloud permanently backed up in Cloud. He noted that all Microsoft documents that staff is working on would be housed at a Microsoft 3260 office off site. Mr. Houck noted that the upgrades come with it.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the annual cost of Microsoft 365 is \$22,893.60 from Planet Technologies; using a government contract price. He noted that he had another quote that is higher. He noted that he also had three quotes for a Microsoft stand alone in each machine and those quotes range from \$33,500 to \$34,700. He noted that it would be a one-time expenditure. He explained, in speaking with Appalachia, the Township could expect, if we go with the standalone in the machine, within the next three to five years, we would have to replace them again. He noted that Microsoft 365 provides Cloud service and housing which provides for another form of backup, but it also provides all the updates on an annual basis automatically installed and it also provides voice over IP telephone system. He noted that we could run our telephone system over the computers and get rid of the current telephone system at no additional costs. He noted that the potential to do this is available as well as several other uses that you don't get with stand alone Microsoft installed in each machine. He noted that it is staff's recommendation for the Board to authorize the purchase of Microsoft 365 from Planet Technologies on an annual lease payment of \$21,693.60 to cover 94 computers.

Mr. Hornung questioned if there are any implementation costs. Mr. Wolfe answered that it is included into the price, other than in house training. Mr. Hogentogler noted that he spoke with Brent from Appalachia and was told that Microsoft has a tutorial for training and he could add it to the employee's page on the web site and each employee could take the time for training at their own convenience. Mr. Crissman noted that having Brent on site could provide additional coverage that may be needed for training problems.

Mr. Houck noted that you can find ways to do almost anything on Microsoft. He noted that he found a way to save thousands of dollars to get the old data out of the Harris System to

the new system. He noted that he was able to do this, email it to Dallas and they will test the system. He noted that it would take some time to do this but it is a big savings.

Mr. Wolfe requested the Board's authorization to move forward with the purchase of this software system

Mr. Crissman made a motion to authorize the purchase of Microsoft 365 for the Township Computers. Mrs. Lindsey seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote and a unanimous vote followed.

Adjournment

Mr. Hornung made a motion to adjourn the meeting and the meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

William L. Hornung
Township Secretary