

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Board Meeting held August 17, 2010

A business meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 7:44 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, and Gary A. Crissman.

Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; Steven Stine, Township Solicitor; Dianne Moran, Planning and Zoning Officer; Stephen Fleming, HRG, Inc.; John Kerschner and George Parmer, Parmer Family Foundation; Robert Fisher, R..J. Fisher and Associates; Matt Witters, H. Edward Black and Associates; and Watson Fisher and Ted Robertson, SWAN.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Hawk dispensed with the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance as it was previously recited during the Sewer Authority Meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the minutes of the August 3, 2010 business meeting. Mr. Seeds seconded the motion, and a unanimous vote followed.

Public Comment

The following public comment was made by Lisa Koup during the previously held Authority Meeting.

Ms. Lisa Koup, 6254 Harding Avenue, noted that she recently was told by the Police after filing a report that her neighbor was shooting a high-power bow and arrow in her neighborhood, that it is not illegal to do this in the Township, as it is not considered to be a weapon unless it has gunpowder. She explained that she has a ten year old daughter and she is afraid to let her play outside or ride her bike because of this situation. She explained that she brought a picture of the boy standing on the curb shooting the arrow toward the backyard. She noted that he has also shot arrows toward the street as well as the back of his yard that have come into her yard. Mr. Hawk questioned if this was a recent incident. Ms. Koup explained that Officer Cover came to her house recently and he tried to speak to the neighbor about the situation.

Mr. Hawk noted that Ms. Koup probably wanted to share these comments with the Board of Supervisors instead of the Authority Board but explained that she could continue to discuss her problem.

Ms. Koup reported that her pediatrician was appalled and explained that an arrow could drop a deer and her daughter is only 71 pounds. Ms. Koup explained that she is terrified of having her daughter playing outside under these conditions. She proceeded to show a picture of a person shooting a bow and arrow from the curb. She requested the Board to pass some type of law that would make it illegal to shoot a bow and arrow in small neighborhoods. She noted that her property is under a quarter of an acre.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the police have been to her house. Ms. Koup answered that the police have been to her house and the officer told her that there was nothing that he could do, and if her daughter was shot, she could file a civil suit. She noted that would be of little importance to her. She questioned what she can do to get a law passed. She explained that she contacted The

Patriot-News, and they are sending a reporter to her home on Monday to talk to her to inform other people about this. Mr. Hornung explained that staff can research this issue to determine what other Townships are doing. Mr. Wolfe noted that he will investigate it to see what the Township's legal ability is and report back to the Board and the victim.

Ms. Koup noted that she has talked to the people about this and it has been going on for three or four years, but now the weapon has changed and it is much larger and more powerful. She noted that there is a farm behind his property and suggested that the neighbor could ask permission to shoot in those fields. She noted that people need rights for hunting, but these actions should not occur in a neighborhood with children and pets.

Mr. Hawk questioned if she was willing to share her information with the Board. Ms. Koup noted that she has a letter from her pediatrician. She showed a picture of the neighbor standing on the curb in front of his house by the street two doors from her home. She proceeded to read a letter from Doctor Consevage, her pediatrician, that was addressed to the Board.

Mr. Hawk noted that Mr. Wolfe will follow up on this issue and try to get a response to Ms. Koup.

Mr. Hornung questioned how the other Board members felt. Mr. Crissman noted that the Board needs to review this issue for the protection of children as well as adults.

Chairman & Board Members' Comments

No comments were presented by Board members.

Manager's Report

Mr. Wolfe explained that there are two ongoing road construction projects in the Township. In regards to the Nyes Road reconstruction project, PENNDOT contracted with Blooming Glen Construction to undertake a \$4.5 million road project that will encompass two

miles of Nyes Road between North Highlands Drive and Willoughby Road. He noted that the first segment of work started this spring is now nearing completion and involves the area between Red Top Road and Union Deposit Road. He noted that a traffic signal was installed at the intersection of Nyes Road and Locust Lane, and it is planned to open that section of roadway on August 25th at which time the signal will be put into operation. He noted that the second phase of the project, from Union Deposit Road to Willoughby Road, will begin the following week and construction will be ongoing until mid to late November.

Mr. Crissman noted when PENNDOT installed the new traffic light on Route 22 at I-83, the lights were put on flash for a period of time. He questioned if that will occur for the Nyes Road and Locust Lane traffic signal. Mr. Wolfe answered, typically, a signal is placed into flash mode, but given that this road has been closed to the motoring public for a significant period of time, they may open the road with the light functioning normally. Mr. Seeds noted that the people driving east on Locust Lane previously had a stop sign.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the Linglestown Road reconstruction is moving along and the contractor, Leon Wintermyer, plans to complete construction on the south side of Linglestown Road this week, except for the final wearing surface. He noted, once this is completed, reconstruction of the north side of Linglestown Road will start. He explained, when this occurs, traffic traveling westbound through Linglestown will be shifted onto the new roadway surface on the south side of the road. He noted that the flow of traffic will remain the same, and the detour that is in place will continue to be in place for the remainder of the project while the north side of the road is reconstructed. He noted that the north lane is expected to be completed by the end of October. He noted if that occurs and the final wearing surface is applied to Linglestown Road by

the end of October, the only work that will remain for next spring will be the roundabout in the Square and other miscellaneous jobs.

Mr. Seeds questioned if the contractor is putting the wearing course on the south side of the road before they shift the road. Mr. Wolfe answered no, and explained, if the contractor can complete the north side of the road before the end of October, he may install the wearing course for both lanes at one time. Mr. Seeds questioned if they will make the switch this week before the wearing course is applied. Mr. Wolfe answered yes. Mr. Seeds noted that the storm sewers are raised and will not catch the water, and he questioned if the contractor is planning to put a temporary patch on the road. Mr. Wolfe answered that the contractor would have to do something to get water into the storm sewers and ensure they are plowable. Mr. Seeds noted that he did not understand why they don't install the wearing course now. Mr. Hornung suggested that when the wearing course is installed they like to do it all at one time so you don't have problems with the seams. He noted that he found that over time the seams open up and crack and then it creates a water problem. Mr. Seeds noted that there will be a problem if they try to pave both lanes at one time. Mr. Wolfe noted that he was told that it would only take a day and a half. Mr. Hornung noted that once the southside is open there will be a lot of new parking areas and he suggested that it could be lined and used. Mr. Wolfe noted that he did not believe that it would be open to parking yet because the parking is back-in parking and it is not angled in the right direction. Mr. Hornung noted if they don't want people to park in those areas, then they need to section it off as people will park in those locations. Mr. Wolfe noted that he would check into this. Mr. Wolfe noted that it may be suitable to use for parallel parking for the time being.

OLD BUSINESS

Resolution 10-25; opposing PA House Bill 2431, which provides for forced local government consolidation

Mr. Hawk explained that Resolution 10-25 opposes Pennsylvania House Bill 2431 which provides for forced local government consolidation. He noted that there has been discussion over the past few years that some legislators are thinking in terms of consolidating municipalities into one county governmental operation. He noted that there are numerous organizations that are opposed to a forced merger or consolidation. He explained that any merger should be initiated by the general citizenry as opposed to a proclamation by the State Legislature.

Mr. Hawk noted that the County Commissioners Association, Pennsylvania League of Cities and Municipalities, Boroughs Association, and the Pennsylvania State Association of Township Supervisors are opposed to this House Bill. He explained that a centralized government was found not to be as cost effective as it initially was thought to be.

Mr. Hawk noted that the County Commissioners, who would benefit from a larger consolidated operation, are convinced that this is not the approach to take and feel that there are other measures that should be considered. He noted that the purpose of the Resolution is to provide opposition to forced mergers or consolidations.

Mr. Hawk noted that starting tomorrow morning, Representative Caltagirone from Lancaster County is going to hold hearings in regard to the consolidations. He noted that he does not expect the bill to go very far, but rather it would provide an opportunity to get some ideas on the table. He noted that most municipalities do a lot of intergovernmental cooperation that is cost beneficial to all government entities.

Mr. Crissman noted that this is a reflection of what has been going on in the United States since the 1700's when Mr. Thomas Jefferson, a firm believer in States' Rights disagreed with

Mr. Hamilton, who was more in favor of a national government. He noted since he is a Jeffersonian, that he would happy to make a motion to adopt Resolution 10-25; opposing Pennsylvania House Bill 2431, which provides for forced local government consolidation. Mr. Seeds seconded the motion.

Mr. Hawk read the words of Thomas Jefferson, “A perfect republic can materialize only in a small jurisdiction such as a Township. They have proved themselves the wisest invention of every device by the wit of man which is exercised for its self government and preservation.”

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

NEW BUSINESS

Preliminary/final subdivision plan for 4220 Linglestown Road

Ms. Moran noted on July 9, 2008 the Planning Commission recommended approval of the above referenced plan subject to the comments, and also recommended that the plan not be finally approved until a LOMR has been submitted to the Township as described in HRG’s outstanding comment #6.

Ms. Moran noted that the 90-day time extension deadline is August 20, 2010 and revised plans have not been submitted. She noted to date the Township has not received a new time extension, and it is staff’s recommendation that the plan be denied based on non-compliance with Township Ordinances.

Mr. Seeds noted that he was a little confused in that he thought that Mr. Mumma signed the new time extension in the past few days. Ms. Moran noted that she did not receive a time extension.

Mr. Hornung questioned if you deny the extension, would the plan go away or do you need to deny the plan. Mr. Wolfe answered that have to deny the plan. Mr. Seeds suggested that

the date of the time extension is an August date. Ms. Moran explained that the last time extension she received from Mr. Mumma was in May and it expires on August 20, 2010. She noted if the Board fails to act on the plan, then it will be deemed approved. Ms. Moran noted that she sent Mr. Mumma another 90-day time extension but he failed to complete and return it to the Township. Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Mumma's last extension is dated May 11, 2010 and it expires August 20, 2010. Mr. Wolfe questioned Mr. Stine, if the Board takes action to deny the plan, must they list the specific reasons. Mr. Stine stated yes they should. Mr. Wolfe noted that the denial can be based upon the fact that Mr. Mumma did not comply with the requirement to provide sidewalks, and the LOMR. Mr. Stine noted that it would be all the items listed in the comments that have not yet been addressed.

Mr. Hornung questioned why you would not deny the extension. Mr. Wolfe noted that you cannot deny the extension since it hasn't been requested. He noted if Mr. Mumma provided an extension, the Board could deny or accept the extension. Mr. Hornung questioned if the plan was not extended why it wouldn't just go away. Mr. Wolfe explained that it would be deemed approved. Mr. Stine noted if you do not act on the plan within 90 days of the settle date or the first Planning Commission Meeting whichever is later... Mr. Hawk questioned if Mr. Mumma has asked for an extension. Mr. Stine answered that he has not returned the forms to the Township.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to deny the preliminary final subdivision plan for 4220 Linglestown Road as the applicant failed to comply with the requirements of the plan. Mr. Seeds seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous vote followed.

Preliminary/final subdivision plan for 6690 Linglestown Road

Ms. Moran noted that the purpose of this plan is to subdivide an existing 7.52 acre parcel of land into three (3) lots; two (2) lots will be residential lots for single family dwellings and the third lot will remain the existing tractor supply use. She noted that all lots will be served by public sewer and individual on-lot water supply. She noted that Lot 1 will consist of 2.00 acres, Lot 2 will consists of 2.08 acres, and Lot 3 will consist of 3.44 acres. The property is zoned AR, Agricultural Residential District and is located along Linglestown Road east of Parkway East and west of Greenwood Road.

Ms. Moran noted on February 25, 2010, the Zoning Hearing Board granted a variance allowing the applicant to create lots that do not meet the lot width requirement of 140' at the minimum building setback line.

Ms. Moran noted on June 9, 2010, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the plan.

Ms. Moran noted that the applicant has requested seven waivers: 1) Waiver of the requirement to provide sidewalk along Linglestown Road; 2) Waiver of the requirement to provide curbing along Linglestown Road; 3) Waiver of the requirement to submit a preliminary plan; 4) Waver of the maximum slope of a residential driveway; 5) Waiver of the minimum width of a shared residential driveway; 6) Waiver of the requirement to provide a planning module in conjunction with or after action on the preliminary plans; and 7) Waiver of the requirement to provide a detailed hydrogeological study. She noted that there are three site specific conditions, nine general conditions to include HRG, Inc's comments and one staff comment.

Ms. Moran noted that Mr. Matt Witters from H. Edward Black and Associates and Mr. Daniel Schiavoni are present to represent the plan.

Mr. Hawk noted that staff supports the first five waivers, and he asked Ms. Moran to provide comments for waivers six and seven. Ms. Moran noted that Mr. Witters will withdraw waiver six and ask that the plan be conditioned upon approval by the Department of Environment Protection (DEP). She noted for the seventh waiver regarding the hydrogeological study, Mr. Witters was in communications with Mr. Steve Fleming and he can speak to that issue.

Mr. Seeds noted that the Township approved the Planning Module at its May 13th meeting, and he questioned if the Board had to do it again. Mr. Wolfe answered that the planning module has not received the approval from DEP; therefore, the plan approval would be contingent on receiving the Planning Module approval. He noted that the applicant, instead of asking for a waiver of the requirement, is requesting that final approval be conditioned upon receipt of an approved planning module.

Mr. Hornung questioned why the Township requires a hydrological study for lots this size. Mr. Fleming answered that it is a standard plan requirement when you have an on-lot water supply. He noted in order to meet the plan requirements for the ordinance, he will support the waiver with well flow data from surrounding wells to insure that there is sufficient capacity in the aquifer to support the new wells. He noted that the applicant has supplied the well flow data to the Township. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Municipal Planning Code does require that any lots that are created have public water or viable water source.

Mr. Matt Witters, H. Edward Black and Associates, noted that there was a misunderstanding on his part for the waiver request for number six regarding the planning

module. He noted that he submitted the request for procedural purposes since the planning module was approved by the Board, so he felt the waiver was required. He noted when talking with staff he felt that it could be withdrawn. Mr. Hawk noted that waiver six will be withdrawn by the applicant and number seven will become number six. Mr. Seeds questioned if the planning module approval should be made a condition. Mr. Fleming noted that it is already a general condition of the plan, number six. Mr. Witters noted that he finalized the planning module with Mr. Stine today for the agreements needed and he hopes to submit the DEP planning module later this week.

Mr. Seeds requested Mr. Witters to address waiver seven. Mr. Witters explained that he asked HRG, Inc. if he could provide information in lieu of a study, and he noted that Mr. Fleming is okay with the information provided. Mr. Fleming explained that Mr. Witters did provide sufficient data to support the capacity of wells in the area. Mr. Seeds asked if they will not need the waiver. Mr. Fleming noted that the waiver was for the study and he supports the waiver.

Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Witters could speak for the plan. Mr. Witters answered yes. Mr. Crissman questioned if he accepts the six waivers, noting the number six has been withdrawn and number seven becomes number six. Mr. Witters answered yes. Mr. Crissman questioned if he accepted the three site specific conditions. Mr. Witters answered yes. Mr. Crissman questioned if he accepted the nine general conditions to include the ninth condition, the letter from HRG, Inc. dated August 5, 2010 with 20 comments. He questioned if he would accept all 20 comments as well as the nine general conditions. Mr. Witters answered yes. Mr. Crissman questioned if he was in acceptance of the one staff comment. Mr. Witters answered yes.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the preliminary/final subdivision plan for 6690 Linglestown Road with the following waivers and conditions: 1) Waiver of the requirement to provide sidewalk along Linglestown Road; 2) Waiver of the requirement to provide curbing along Linglestown Road; 3) Waiver of the requirement to submit a preliminary plan; 4) Waiver of the maximum slope of a residential driveway; 5) Waiver of the minimum width of a shared residential driveway; 6) Waiver of the requirement to provide a detailed hydrogeological study; 7) When a subdivision plan creates new lots, the parcel number of each lot must be included on the plan. The lot numbers and parcel numbers shall be listed under Site data. Contact D.C. Tax Assessment for the parcel numbers; 8) Any subdivision or development plan proposing the use of a private on-lot water supply shall include a detailed hydrogeological study; 9) Provide a copy of a declaration for the shared driveway. This declaration agreement shall be reviewed by the Township Solicitor; 10) Plan approval shall be subject to payment of recreational fee in lieu of \$2300 per lot for two (2) newly created building lots; 11) Plan approval shall be subject to providing original seals and signatures; 12) Plan approval shall be subject to the payment of engineering review fees; 13) Plan approval shall be subject to the establishment of an improvement guarantee for the proposed site improvements; 14) Plan approval shall be subject to the Dauphin County Conservation District's review of the Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan; 15) Plan approval shall be subject to DEP's approval of a sewage facilities planning module; 16) Plan approval shall be subject to Lower Paxton Township Sewer Department's review and approval of the sanitary sewer design; 17) Pursuant to Section 420 of the Act of June 1, 1945 (P.L. 1242 No. 428) known as the state highway law, a highway occupancy permit is required for all construction within PennDOT right of way; 18) Plan approval shall be subject to addressing the twenty (20) comments of HRG's memo dated August 5, 2010; and 19) A

street/storm sewer construction permit is required and is to be obtained prior to earthmoving activities. A pre-construction meeting is to be held prior to starting the project. Contact Matt Miller at 657-5615 to schedule the meeting. This may be held on conjunction with the Conservation District meeting. Mr. Hornung seconded the motion.

Mr. Seeds questioned if any conditions need to be removed. Mr. Stine noted that the condition would be automatically removed because the waiver takes precedent. Mr. Hawk called for a roll call vote: Mr. Crissman, aye; Mr. Hornung, aye; Mr. Seeds, aye; and Mr. Hawk, aye.

Preliminary/final land development plan for
Pleasant Meadows Independent Living Development

Ms. Moran noted that the purpose of this plan is to provide an independent living development containing approximately ninety (90) single family residential units and sixty (60) apartment-style units. This property contains 36.09 acres and is zoned Residential-Cluster. The property is located north of Locust Lane and west of the intersection of Locust Lane and Fairmont Drive. The property will be served by public sewer and public water.

Ms. Moran noted that the Zoning Hearing Board granted a variance via docket #1254 allowing the development of the parcel with a total of 150 units, of which no less than 90 be single family detached dwellings with the condition that the development proceed as an age-restricted community.

Ms. Moran noted on June 9, 2010, the Lower Paxton Township Planning Commission recommended approval of this plan.

Ms. Moran noted on July 13, 2010, the applicant met with the Board of Supervisors in workshop session to discuss the waivers requested for the plan. The applicant has requested the following waivers: 1)Waiver of the requirement to provide curb and sidewalk on Locust Lane west of proposed Primrose Place and sidewalk along a small portion along Fairmont Drive; 2)

Waiver of the requirement to provide sidewalks along the private streets within the development. (An off-street pedestrian walkway is being installed); 3) Waiver of the requirement to provide curbing and widening of adjacent streets; 4) Waiver of the cul-de-sac diameter and construction; 5) Waiver of the 30' width street requirement for private streets within the development; 6) Waiver of the 275' minimum street centerline radii requirement. The applicant is proposing a street centerline radius of 150 feet; 7) Waiver of the 400' minimum separation distance requirement between minor or private street intersections. (The minimum alternate separation distance being proposed is 150 feet); 8) Waiver of the requirement to provide vertical curbing; 9) Waiver of the requirement to provide a preliminary plan; and 10) Waiver of the plant sheet size requirement.

Ms. Moran noted that a general condition needs to be added to the plan that when final plans are submitted for approval that all of HRG, Inc's comments be addressed prior the recording the plan.

Mr. James Snyder, Snyder Secary & Associates, on behalf of the Parmer Family Foundation, explained that there is a request for a fair amount of waivers for the plan and on August 6, 2010, additional information was submitted to the Board, and unless there are any specific questions relative to that, he felt that it would be appropriate to continue to meet with the Board members in a workshop session to further discuss the proposal and waivers. Mr. Hawk questioned Mr. Wolfe if he would schedule this for the September workshop meeting. Mr. Wolfe answered yes.

Mr. Snyder noted that the applicant granted an extension to the plan and there is plenty of time to engage in further discussions.

Preliminary/final subdivision plan for John Delegram

Ms. Moran noted that the purpose of this plan is to subdivide tax parcel 35-072-044 (Lot 1) and add a portion of the subdivided lot to tax parcel 35-070-029 (Lot 2). The properties are zoned R-1 Low Density Residential District and the total property is made up of 2.636 acres. She noted that Lot 1 will consist of .92 acres and Lot 2 will consist of 1.71 acres. She explained that the properties are located on Lyters Lane west of Shatto Drive and will be served by private wells and public sewer. She noted that no new public or private improvements are proposed as part of this plan.

Ms. Moran noted on July 14, 2010, the Planning Commission recommended approval of the plan and the following waivers: 1) Waiver of the preliminary plan requirement; 2) Waiver of the requirement to provide curbs, sidewalks and street widening; 3) Waiver of the requirement to provide a stormwater management plan; and 4) Waiver of the requirement to provide an erosion and sedimentation control plan. Ms. Moran noted that there are four general conditions for this plan. She noted that Mr. Bob Fisher from R. J. Fisher and Associates is present to represent the plan.

Mr. Bob Fisher from R.J. Fisher and Associates noted that the main item from HRG, Inc's comments concerns the sight distance for the driveway. He noted that he is taking two lots and moving the lot line. He explained that the triangle shaped lot was created by a subdivision of the Brown Farm across the street not too long ago. He explained that this property does not have access to Shatto Drive, and has proposed a location that provides the best sight distance. He explained that there are some existing shrubs on the neighboring property, and Mr. Delegram has talked to his neighbor about removing the scrubs and replacing them with ground coverings, and he is agreeable to that. He noted that when they are doing the excavations for the basement

construction, they would shave a little dirt off the bank along the roadway. He noted that while the plan does not meet the optimal sight distance for PENNDOT, it does exceed the minimum sight distance. He noted that he would be installing a turn-around area in the driveway so that Mr. Delegram would not have to back out into the roadway.

Mr. Hornung noted, in a situation like this when you must pull out from the driveway with a limited sight distance, if there are enough cars parked in the turn-around driveway, then a vehicle would have to back out into the roadway. He requested that the turn around area accommodate a two-car width to provide room to make the turn-around. He noted that he would hate to see an accident occur as a family attempted to back out of the driveway. Mr. Fisher noted that Mr. Delegram already planned to make a large turn-around area since he lives in the area.

Mr. Crissman questioned if Mr. Fisher could speak on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Fisher answered yes. Mr. Crissman questioned if he accepted the four waivers. Mr. Fisher answered yes. Mr. Crissman questioned if he accepted the four general conditions to include the 4th condition which includes the memo from HRG dated August 2, 2010, and its nine comments. Mr. Fisher answered yes, with the caveat of the sight distance requirement. Mr. Crissman questioned Mr. Fleming if he accepted Mr. Fisher's solution to the issue. Mr. Fleming answered that the information the applicant provided was satisfactory to meet PENNDOT's minimum requirement.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the preliminary/final subdivision plan for John Delegram with the following waivers and conditions: 1) Waiver of the preliminary plan requirement; 2) Waiver of the requirement to provide curbs, sidewalks and street widening; 3) Waiver of the requirement to provide a stormwater management plan; 4) Waiver of the requirement to provide an erosion and sedimentation control plan; 5) Plan approval shall be

subject to providing original seals and signatures on the plan; 6) Plan approval shall be subject to the payment of engineering review fees; 7) Plan approval shall be subject to the establishment of an improvement guarantee for the proposed site improvements; and 8) Plan approval shall be subject to addressing the nine (9) comments of HRG's memo dated August 2, 2010. Mr. Hornung seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a roll call vote: Mr. Crissman, aye; Mr. Hornung, aye; Mr. Seeds, aye; and Mr. Hawk, aye.

IMPROVEMENT GUARANTEES

Mr. Hawk noted that there was one Improvement Guarantee.

Hoffman Ford Sales

A new letter of credit with Mid Penn Bank, in the amount of \$14,157.00, with an expiration date of August 17, 2011.

Mr. Seeds questioned what Hoffman Ford was building. Mr. Fleming answered that they were building an addition to their body shop. Mr. Seeds noted that they did not have to submit a land development plan since it was a small addition. Mr. Fleming responded that Hoffman Ford submitted a land development plan and it was approved by the Board.

Mr. Crissman made a motion to approve the one listed Improvement Guarantee. Mr. Seeds seconded the motion. Mr. Hawk called for a voice vote, and a unanimous voice vote followed.

Payment of Bills

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

Adjournment

There being no further business, Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Hornung seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle
Recording Secretary

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman
Township Secretary